



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

B 1,015,516

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY  
DEBATES

AUTHORISED EDITION

For Second Session 1892

---

ONLY VOLUME OF SESSION

---

Continued the Debates of Both Houses

From 1891

To the AUGUST 1892 and the DEBATES AUGUST,  
1892.

---

HAUTERS TELEGRAM COMPANY, LIMITED.

21 and 22, Old Bailey, London, E.C.

PRINTED, PUBLISHED, AND FORWARDED BY

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, AUTHORIZED EDITION.

Printed and Published by H.M. Government.

1892



U  
301  
H21





THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

AUTHORISED EDITION.

FOURTH SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT  
OF THE  
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

---

56 VICTORIÆ.

---

VOLUME VII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM  
THE FOURTH DAY OF AUGUST  
TO  
THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF AUGUST,  
1892.

---

**Second Session, 1892 (Complete).**

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.  
THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE REIGN.

---

REUTER'S TELEGRAM COMPANY, LIMITED,  
24 and 25, Old Jewry, London, E.C.,

PRINTERS, PUBLISHERS, AND PROPRIETORS OF  
"THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES AUTHORISED EDITION,"  
UNDER CONTRACT WITH H.M. GOVERNMENT.

---

1892.



#### ERRATA.

4 *August.* Page 5, line 29, should read "To-morrow at *Twelve.*"

8 *August.* Page 156, line 26, should read "it was *opposed.*"



# PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT.

---

*At the Court at Windsor, the 28th day of June, 1892.*

P R E S E N T ,

The QUEEN's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.

**I**T is this day ordered by Her Majesty in Council that the Parliament be prorogued from Tuesday, the twenty-eighth day of June instant, to Friday, the fifteenth day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-two, and that the Right Honourable the Lord High Chancellor of that part of the United Kingdom called Great Britain do cause a Commission to be prepared and issued in the usual manner for proroguing the Parliament accordingly.

# DISSOLUTION OF PARLIAMENT.

---

BY THE QUEEN.

---

## A PROCLAMATION,

*For Dissolving the present Parliament, and declaring the  
calling of another.*

Victoria, R.

**W**HEREAS We have thought fit, by and with the advice of Our Privy Council, to dissolve this present Parliament which stands prorogued to Friday, the fifteenth day of July next : We do, for that end, publish this Our Royal Proclamation, and do hereby dissolve the said Parliament accordingly ; and the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses, and the Commissioners for shires and burghs, of the House of Commons, are discharged from their meeting and attendance on the said Friday, the fifteenth day of July next : And We, being desirous and resolved, as soon as may be, to meet Our people, and to have their advice in Parliament, do hereby make known to all Our loving subjects Our Royal Will and Pleasure to call a new Parliament ; and do hereby further declare, that, with the advice of Our Privy Council, We have given order that Our Chancellor of that part of Our United Kingdom called Great Britain and Our Chancellor of Ireland do respectively, upon notice thereof, forthwith issue out writs, in due form and according to law, for calling a new Parliament. And We do hereby also, by this Our Royal Proclamation under Our Great Seal of Our United Kingdom, require writs forthwith to be issued accordingly by Our said Chancellors respectively, for causing the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons who are to serve in the said Parliament to be duly returned to, and give their attendance in, Our said Parliament on the fourth day of August next, which writs are to be returnable in due course of law.

Given at Our Court at *Windsor*, this twenty-eighth day of *June*, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-two, and in the fifty-sixth year of Our Reign.

GOD save the QUEEN.

# ELECTION OF SCOTTISH PEERS.

BY THE QUEEN.

## A PROCLAMATION,

*In order to the Electing and Summoning the Sixteen Peers of Scotland.*

Victoria, R.

**W**HEREAS We have in Our Council thought fit to declare Our pleasure for summoning and holding a Parliament of Our United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, on Thursday, the fourth day of August next ensuing the date hereof; in order, therefore, to the electing and summoning the Sixteen Peers of Scotland who are to sit in the House of Peers in the said Parliament, We do, by the advice of Our Privy Council, issue forth this Our Royal Proclamation, strictly charging and commanding all the Peers of Scotland to assemble and meet at Holyrood House, in Edinburgh, on Thursday, the fourteenth day of July next, between the hours of twelve and two in the afternoon, to nominate and choose the Sixteen Peers to sit and vote in the House of Peers in the said ensuing Parliament by open election and plurality of voices of the Peers that shall be then present, and of the proxies of such as shall be absent (such proxies being Peers, and producing a mandate in writing duly signed before witnesses, and both the constituent and proxy being qualified according to law); and the Lord Clerk Register, or the two Principal Clerks of the Session appointed by him to officiate in his name, are hereby respectively required to attend such meeting, and to administer the oaths required by law to be taken there by the said Peers, and to take their votes, and immediately after such election made and duly examined to certify the names of the Sixteen Peers so elected, and to sign and attest the same in the presence of the said Peers the Electors, and return such certificate into Our High Court of Chancery of Great Britain. And We do, by this Our Royal Proclamation, strictly command and require the Provost of Edinburgh, and all other the Magistrates of the said city, to take especial care to preserve the peace thereof during the time of the said election, and to prevent all manner of riots, tumults, disorders, and violence whatsoever. And We strictly charge and command that this Our Royal Proclamation be duly published at the Market-Cross at Edinburgh, and in all the county towns of Scotland, ten days at least before the time hereby appointed for the meeting of the said Peers to proceed to such election.

Witness Ourselves at *Windsor*, this twenty-eighth day of *June*, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-two, and in the fifty-sixth year of Our Reign.

GOD save the QUEEN.





# THE MINISTRY

OF THE MOST NOBLE THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY, K.G.,  
AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION ON THE 4TH AUGUST, 1892.

## THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs . . . . .	Most Hon. Marquess of SALISBURY, K.G.
First Lord of the Treasury . . . . .	Right Hon. ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.
Lord Chancellor of England . . . . .	Right Hon. Lord HALSBURY.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland . . . . .	Right Hon. Lord ASHBOURNE.
Lord President of the Council . . . . .	Right Hon. Viscount CRANBROOK, G.C.S.I.
Lord Privy Seal . . . . .	Right Hon. Earl CADOGAN.
Secretary of State, Home Department . . . . .	Right Hon. HENRY MATTHEWS.
Secretary of State for the Colonies . . . . .	Right Hon. Lord KNUTSFORD, G.C.M.G.
Secretary of State for War . . . . .	Right Hon. EDWARD STANHOPE.
Secretary of State for India . . . . .	Right Hon. Viscount CROSS, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.
Chancellor of the Exchequer . . . . .	Right Hon. GEORGE JOACHIM GOSCHEN.
First Lord of the Admiralty . . . . .	Right Hon. Lord GEORGE FRANCIS HAMILTON.
President of the Board of Trade . . . . .	Right Hon. Sir M. E. HICKS BEACH, Bart.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster . . . . .	His Grace the Duke of RUTLAND, G.C.B.
Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant . . . . .	Right Hon. WILLIAM LAWIES JACKSON.
President of the Local Government Board . . . . .	Right Hon. CHARLES THOMSON RITCHIE.
President of the Board of Agriculture . . . . .	Right Hon. HENRY CHAPLIN.

## NOT IN THE CABINET.

Field Marshal Commanding in Chief . . . . .	H.R.H. the Duke of CAMBRIDGE, K.G.
Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education . . . . .	Right Hon. Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE, Bart.
Secretary for Scotland and Vice President of the Scotch Education Department . . . . .	Most Hon. Marquess of LOTHIAN, K.T.
First Commissioner of Works and Public Buildings . . . . .	Right Hon. DAVID ROBERT PLUNKET.
Lords of the Treasury . . . . .	Hon. SIDNEY HERBERT. Colonel Sir WILLIAM HOOD WALBROND, Bart. Sir HERBERT EUSTACE MAXWELL, Bart. Admiral Sir A. H. HOSKINS, K.C.B., Vice Admirals Sir F. W. RICHARDS, K.C.B., Rear Admiral JOHN A. FISHER, C.B., Rear Admiral F. G. D. BEDFORD, C.B., ELLIS ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, Esq.
Lords of the Admiralty . . . . .	Right Hon. ARETAS AKERS-DOUGLAS. Right Hon. Sir JOHN ELDON GORST, Q.C. Right Hon. ARTHUR BOWER FORWOOD. Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH. WALTER H. LONG, Esq. CHARLES BEILBY STUART WORTLEY, Esq. JAMES WILLIAM LOWTHER, Esq.
Joint Secretaries to the Treasury . . . . .	Right Hon. Baron HENRY DE WORMS.
Secretary to the Admiralty . . . . .	Right Hon. Earl BROWNLAW.
Secretary to the Board of Trade . . . . .	Hon. GEORGE N. CURZON.
Secretary to the Local Government Board . . . . .	Right Hon. Lord WINDSOR.
Under Secretary, Home Department . . . . .	Right Hon. Sir JAMES FERGUSON, Bart., G.C.S.I.
Under Secretary, Foreign Department . . . . .	Hon. W. St. JOHN BRODRICK.
Under Secretary for Colonies . . . . .	Right Hon. Sir WILLIAM THACKERAY MARRIOTT.
Under Secretary for War . . . . .	Sir RICHARD EVERARD WEBSTER, Q.C.
Under Secretary for India . . . . .	Sir EDWARD GEORGE CLARKE, Q.C.
Paymaster General . . . . .	
Postmaster General . . . . .	
Financial Secretary to the War Department . . . . .	
Judge Advocate General . . . . .	
Attorney General . . . . .	
Solicitor General . . . . .	

## SCOTLAND.

Lord Advocate . . . . .	Right Hon. Sir C. J. PEARSON.
Solicitor General . . . . .	ANDREW GRAHAM MURRAY, Esq.

## IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant . . . . .	Right Hon. Earl of ZETLAND.
Lord Chancellor . . . . .	Right Hon. Lord ASHBOURNE.
Attorney General . . . . .	Right Hon. J. ATKINSON.
Solicitor General . . . . .	EDWARD CARSON, Esq.

## QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD.

Lord Steward . . . . .	Right Hon. Earl of MOUNT-EDGCOMBE.
Lord Chamberlain . . . . .	Right Hon. Earl of LATHOM.
Master of the Horse . . . . .	His Grace the Duke of PORTLAND.
Treasurer of the Household . . . . .	Right Hon. Lord WALTER GORDON-LENNOX.
Comptroller of the Household . . . . .	Right Hon. Lord ARTHUR HILL.
Vice Chamberlain of the Household . . . . .	Right Hon. Lord BURGHLEY.
Captain of the Corps of Gentlemen at Arms . . . . .	Right Hon. Earl of YARBOROUGH.
Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard . . . . .	Right Hon. Earl of LIMERICK.
Master of the Buckhounds . . . . .	Right Hon. Earl of COVENTRY.
Chief Equerry and Clerk Marshal . . . . .	Colonel Sir G. A. MAUDE, V.C., K.C.B.
Mistress of the Robes . . . . .	Her Grace the Duchess of BUCKLEUCH.



# ROLL OF THE LORDS SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL

IN

THE FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

OF

THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND  
IRELAND.

---

56° VICTORIÆ, 1892.

---

*MEM.—According to the Usage of Parliament, when the House appoints a Select Committee, the Lords appointed to serve upon it are named in the Order of their Rank, beginning with the Highest; and so, when the House sends a Committee to a Conference with the Commons the Lord highest in Rank is called first, and the rest go forth in like Order: But when the Whole House is called over for any Purpose within the House, or for the Purpose of proceeding forth to Westminster Hall, or upon any public Solemnity, the Call begins invariably with the Junior Baron.*

His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales.	His Royal Highness George William Frederick Charles Duke of Cambridge.
His Royal Highness Alfred Ernest Albert Duke of Edinburgh.	Edward White Archbishop of Canterbury.
His Royal Highness Arthur William Patrick Albert Duke of Connaught and Strathearn.	Hardinge Stanley Lord Halsbury, <i>Lord High Chancellor.</i>
His Royal Highness George Frederick Ernest Albert, Duke of York.	William Dalrymple Archbishop of York.
His Royal Highness Leopold Charles Edward George Albert Duke of Albany.	Gathorne Viscount Cranbrook, <i>Lord President of the Council.</i>
	George Henry Earl Cadogan, <i>Lord Privy Seal.</i>

## ROLL OF THE LORDS

Henry Duke of Norfolk, <i>Earl Marshal of England.</i>	Hugh de Grey Marquess of Hertford.
Algernon Percy Banks Duke of Somerset.	John Patrick Marquess of Bute.
Charles Henry Duke of Richmond.	William Alleyne Marquess of Exeter.
Augustus Charles Lennox Duke of Grafton.	William Marquess of Northampton.
Henry Charles Fitzroy Duke of Beaufort.	John Charles Marquess Camden.
William Amelius Aubrey de Vere Duke of Saint Albans.	Henry Marquess of Anglesey.
George Godolphin Duke of Leeds.	George Henry Hugh Marquess of Cholmondeley.
George William Francis Sackville Duke of Bedford.	George William Thomas Marquess of Ailesbury.
Spencer Compton Duke of Devonshire.	Frederick William John Marquess of Bristol.
George Charles Duke of Marlborough.	Archibald Marquess of Ailsa.
John James Robert Duke of Rutland.	Constantine Charles Henry Marquess of Normanby.
William Alexander Louis Stephen Duke of Brandon. ( <i>Duke of Hamilton.</i> )	George Frederick Samuel Marquess of Ripon.
William John Arthur Charles James Duke of Portland.	William Marquess of Abergavenny.
George Victor Drogo Duke of Manchester.	Gavin Marquess of Breadalbane.
Henry Pelham Archibald Douglas Duke of Newcastle.	Frederick Temple Marquess of Dufferin and Ava.
Algernon George Duke of Northumberland.	William Henry Earl of Mount Edgumbe, <i>Lord Steward of the Household.</i>
His Royal Highness Ernest Augustus William Adolphus George Frederick Duke of Cumberland and Teviotdale.	Edward Earl of Lathom, <i>Lord Chamberlain of the Household.</i>
Henry Duke of Wellington.	Charles Henry John Earl of Shrewsbury.
George Granville William Duke of Sutherland.	Edward Henry Earl of Derby.
Hugh Lupus Duke of Westminster.	Warner Francis John Plantagenet Earl of Huntingdon.
Alexander William George Duke of Fife.	George Robert Charles Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery.
George Douglas Duke of Argyll.	Henry Hugh Earl of Devon.
Augustus John Henry Beaumont Marquess of Winchester.	Henry Charles Earl of Suffolk and Berkshire.
Henry Charles Keith Marquess of Lansdowne.	Rudolph Robert Basil Earl of Denbigh.
John Villiers Stuart Marquess Townshend.	Anthony Mildmay Julian Earl of Westmorland.
Robert Arthur Talbot Marquess of Salisbury.	Montague Earl of Lindsey.
John Alexander Marquess of Bath.	——— Earl of Stamford.
James Marquess of Abercorn. ( <i>Duke of Abercorn.</i> )	Murray Edward Gordon Earl of Winchelsea and Nottingham.
	Edwyn Francis Earl of Chesterfield.
	Edward George Henry Earl of Sandwich.
	Arthur Algernon Earl of Essex.
	George James Earl of Carlisle.

## SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL.

William Henry Walter Earl of Doncaster. ( <i>Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry.</i> )	George Guy Earl Brooke and Earl of Warwick.
Anthony Earl of Shaftesbury.	Sidney Carr Earl of Buckinghamshire.
Randal Mowbray Thomas Earl of Berkeley.	William Thomas Spencer Earl Fitzwilliam.
Montagu Arthur Earl of Abingdon.	Frederick George Earl of Guilford.
Aldred Frederick George Beresford Earl of Scarbrough.	Charles Philip Earl of Hardwicke.
William Coutts Earl of Albemarle.	Henry Edward Earl of Ilchester.
George William Earl of Coventry.	Reginald Windsor Earl De La Warr.
Victor Albert George Earl of Jersey.	<del>William Earl of Radnor.</del>
William Henry Earl Poulett.	John Poyntz Earl Spencer.
John Francis Erskine Earl of Mar. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	Allen Alexander Earl Bathurst.
Sholto George Watson Earl of Morton. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	Arthur Wills John Wellington Blundell Trumbull Earl of Hillsborough. ( <i>Marquess of Downshire.</i> )
Walter John Francis Earl of Mar and Kellie. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	Edward Hyde Earl of Clarendon.
George Earl of Haddington. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	William David Earl of Mansfield.
Frederick Henry Earl of Lauderdale. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	John James Hugh Henry Earl Strange. ( <i>Duke of Athole.</i> )
John Trotter Earl of Lindsay. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	William Henry Earl of Mount Edgumbe. ( <i>In another Place as Lord Steward of the Household.</i> )
David Stanley William Earl of Airlie. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	Hugh Earl Fortescue.
Robert Harris Earl of Carnwath.	George Edward Stanhope Molyneux Earl of Carnarvon.
Ronald Ruthven Earl of Leven and Melville. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	George Henry Earl Cadogan. ( <i>In another Place as Lord Privy Seal.</i> )
Douglas Mackinnon Baillie Hamilton Earl of Dundonald. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	Edward James Earl of Malmesbury.
Sewallis Edward Earl Ferrers.	John Vansittart Danvers Earl of Lanesborough. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
William Heneage Earl of Dartmouth.	Henry Ernest Newcomen Earl of Kingston. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
Charles Earl of Tankerville.	Dermot Robert Wyndham Earl of Mayo. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
Charles Wightwick Earl of Aylesford.	Hugh Earl Annesley. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
Francis Thomas De Grey Earl Cowper.	George Earl of Lucan. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
Arthur Philip Earl Stanhope.	Somerset Richard Earl of Belmore. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
Thomas Augustus Wolstenholme Earl of Macclesfield.	James Francis Earl of Bandon. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
Douglas Beresford Malise Ronald Earl Graham. ( <i>Duke of Montrose.</i> )	James Earl of Caledon. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
William Frederick Earl Waldegrave.	James Francis Harry Earl of Rosslyn.
Bertram Earl of Ashburnham.	William George Robert Earl of Craven.
Charles Augustus Earl of Harrington.	William Hillier Earl of Onslow.
Newton Earl of Portsmouth.	

## ROLL OF THE LORDS

Charles Earl of Romney.	Thomas William Earl of Leicester.
Walter John Earl of Chichester.	William Earl of Lovelace.
Seymour John Grey Earl of Wilton.	Lawrence Earl of Zetland.
George Charles Earl of Powis.	Charles William Francis Earl of Gainsborough.
Horatio Earl Nelson.	Francis Charles Granville Earl of Ellesmere.
Lawrence Earl of Rothes.	George Henry Charles Earl of Strafford.
<i>Ireland.</i>	Kenelm Charles Edward Earl of Cottingham.
Sydney William Herbert Earl Manvers.	William Henry Earl Cowley.
Horatio Earl of Orford.	Archibald William Earl of Winton.
Henry Earl Grey.	<i>(Earl of Eglintoun.)</i>
Hugh Cecil Earl of Lonsdale.	William Humble Earl of Dudley.
Dudley Francis Stuart Earl of Harrowby.	John Francis Stanley Earl Russell.
Henry Ulick Earl of Harewood.	Francis Earl of Cromartie.
Gilbert John Earl of Minto.	John Earl of Kimberley.
Alan Frederick Earl Cathcart.	Richard Earl of Dartrey.
James Walter Earl of Verulam.	William Ernest Earl of Feversham.
Adelbert Wellington Brownlow Earl Brownlow.	Henry George Earl of Ravensworth.
Henry Cornwallis Earl of St. Germans.	Edward Montagu Stuart Granville Earl of Wharnccliffe.
Albert Edmund Earl of Morley.	Thomas George Earl of Northbrook.
Orlando George Charles Earl of Bradford.	Herbert John Earl Cairns.
William Earl Beauchamp.	Victor Alexander George Robert Earl of Lytton.
John Earl of Eldon.	Edward Earl of Lathom. <i>(In another Place as Lord Chamberlain of the Household.)</i>
Richard William Penn Earl Howe.	George Watson Earl Sondes.
George Edward John Mowbray Earl of Stradbroke.	Roundell Earl of Selborne.
William Stephen Earl Temple of Stowe.	Walter Stafford Earl of Iddesleigh.
Francis Charles Earl of Kilmorey.	Cornwallis Earl de Montalt.
<i>(Elected for Ireland.)</i>	William Henry Forester Earl of Londesborough.
Charles Stewart Earl Vane. <i>(Marquess of Londonderry.)</i>	Robert Viscount Hereford.
William Archer Earl Amherst.	James David Viscount Strathallan.
John Frederick Vaughan Earl Cawdor.	<i>(Elected for Scotland.)</i>
William George Earl of Munster.	Henry Viscount Bolingbroke and St. John.
Robert Adam Philips Haldane Earl of Camperdown.	Charles George Viscount Cobham.
Thomas Francis Earl of Lichfield.	Evelyn Edward Thomas Viscount Falmouth.
John George Earl of Durham.	George Master Viscount Torrington.
Granville George Earl Granville.	Gerald Viscount Leinster. <i>(Duke of Leinster.)</i>
Henry Earl of Effingham.	Francis Wheler Viscount Hood.
Henry John Earl of Ducie.	
Charles Alfred Worsley Earl of Yarborough.	
James Henry Robert Earl Innes. <i>(Duke of Roxburghe.)</i>	

## SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL.

Mervyn Edward Viscount Powerscourt. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )	Ernest Roland Bishop of Newcastle.
Henry William Crosbie Viscount Bangor. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )	Richard Bishop of Llandaff.
Cornwallis Viscount Hawarden. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> ) ( <i>In another Place as Earl de Montalt.</i> )	William Bishop of Oxford.
Carnegie Parker Viscount St. Vincent.	George Bishop of Southwell.
Henry Viscount Melville.	William Boyd Bishop of Ripon.
William Wells Viscount Sidmouth.	Edward Bishop of Lincoln.
John Campbell Viscount Gordon. ( <i>Earl of Aberdeen</i> )	Edward Henry Bishop of Exeter.
Edward Fleetwood John Viscount Exmouth.	John Bishop of Salisbury.
John Luke George Viscount Hutchinson ( <i>Earl of Donoughmore.</i> )	Alwyne Bishop of Ely.
William Frederick Viscount Clancarty. ( <i>Earl of Clancarty.</i> )	James Bishop of Manchester.
Robert Wellington Viscount Combermere.	William Walsham Bishop of Wakefield.
Henry Charles Viscount Canterbury.	Francis John Bishop of Chester.
Rowland Clegg Viscount Hill.	Alfred George Bishop of St. Asaph.
Charles Stewart Viscount Hardinge.	Daniel Lewis Bishop of Bangor.
George Stephens Viscount Gough.	
Charles Lindley Viscount Halifax.	Henry Thurstan Lord Knutsford, <i>One of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State.</i>
Alexander Nelson Viscount Bridport.	Dudley Charles Lord de Ros.
William Henry Berkeley Viscount Portman.	Alfred Joseph Lord Mowbray.
Gathorne Viscount Cranbrook. ( <i>In another Place as Lord President of the Council.</i> )	George Manners Lord Hastings.
Henry Robert Viscount Hampden.	Edward Southwell Lord de Clifford.
Garnet Joseph Viscount Wolseley.	Gilbert Henry Lord Willoughby de Eresby.
William John Viscount Oxenbridge.	Charles Henry Rolle Lord Clinton.
Richard Assheton Viscount Cross.	Robert Nathaniel Cecil George Lord Zouche of Haryngworth.
	Rawdon George Grey Lord Grey de Ruthyn.
Frederick Bishop of London.	Charles Edward Hastings Lord Botheraux. ( <i>Earl of Loudoun.</i> )
Brooke Foss Bishop of Durham.	Francis Robert Lord Camoys.
Anthony Wilson Bishop of Winchester.	Miles Lord Beaumont.
John Thomas Bishop of Norwich.	Henry Lord Willoughby de Broke.
Charles John Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.	Hubert George Charles Lord Vaux Harrowden.
James Bishop of Hereford.	Ralph Gordon Lord Wentworth.
Arthur Charles Bishop of Bath and Wells.	Alfred Thomas Townshend Lord Bray.
Richard Bishop of Chichester.	Robert George Lord Windsor.
William Basil Bishop of St. David's.	William Henry John Lord North.
Charles John Bishop of Liverpool.	Beauchamp Mowbray Lord St. John of Bletso.
	Frederick George Lord Howard de Walden.
	William Joseph Lord Petre.
	John Fiennes Lord Saye and Sele.



## ROLL OF THE LORDS

John Francis Lord Arundell of Wardour.	Edward Lennox Lord Sherborne.
John Stuart Lord Clifton. ( <i>Earl of Darnley.</i> )	Job Henry De La Poer Lord Tyrone. ( <i>Marquess of Waterford.</i> )
John Baptist Joseph Lord Dormer.	Richard Henry Lord Carleton. ( <i>Earl of Shannon.</i> )
Henry John Lord Teynham.	Charles Lord Suffield.
FitzOsbert Edward Lord Stafford.	Dudley Wilmot Lord Dorchester.
George Frederick William Lord Byron.	Lloyd Lord Kenyon.
Lewis Henry Hugh Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.	Charles Cornwallis Lord Braybrooke.
Horace Courtenay Gammell Lord Forbes. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	George Augustus Hamilton Lord Fishwick. ( <i>Marquess of Donegall.</i> )
Alexander William Frederick Lord Saltoun. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	Henry Charles Lord Gage. ( <i>Viscount Gage.</i> )
Charles William Lord Sinclair. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	Thomas John Lord Thurlow
Alexander Hugh Lord Balfour of Burley. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	William Morton Lord Auckland.
Walter Hugh Lord Polwarth. ( <i>Elected for Scotland.</i> )	Henry George Lord Mendip. ( <i>Viscount Clifden.</i> )
Henry Lord Barnard.	George Lord Stuart of Castle Stuart. ( <i>Earl of Moray.</i> )
Richard Edmund Saint Lawrence Lord Boyle. ( <i>Earl of Cork and Orrery.</i> )	Alan Plantagenet Lord Stewart of Garlies. ( <i>Earl of Galloway.</i> )
George Lord Hay. ( <i>Earl of Kinnoul.</i> )	James George Henry Lord Saltersford. ( <i>Earl of Courtown.</i> )
Digby Wentworth Bayard Lord Middleton.	William Lord Brodrick. ( <i>Viscount Middleton.</i> )
Frederick George Brabazon Lord Ponsonby. ( <i>Earl of Bessborough.</i> )	Frederick Henry William Lord Calthorpe.
Alfred Nathaniel Holden Lord Scarsdale.	Robert Peter Lord Gwydir.
George Florance Lord Boston.	Charles Robert Lord Carrington.
Charles George Lord Lovell and Holland. ( <i>Earl of Egmont.</i> )	William Henry Lord Bolton.
George William Henry Lord Vernon.	Thomas Lyttleton Lord Lilford.
Edward Henry Trafalgar Lord Digby.	Thomas Lord Ribblesdale.
Martin Bladen Lord Hawke.	Edward Donough Lord Inchiquin. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
Henry Thomas Lord Foley.	William Charles Lord Carbery. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
Arthur de Cardonnel Lord Dinevor.	John Thomas William Lord Massy. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
Thomas Lord Walsingham.	Hamilton Lord Muskerry.
William Lord Bagot.	Francis William Lord Kilmaine. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
Charles Henry Lord Southampton.	Robert Lord Clonbrock. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
John Richard Brinsley Lord Grantley.	Charles Mark Lord Headley. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
George Bridges Harley Dennett Lord Rodney.	Edward Henry Churchill Lord Crofton. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
Henry George Lord Lovaine.	
Philip Reginald Lord Somers.	
Richard Henry Lord Berwick.	

## SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL.

Hercules Edward Lord Langford. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )	Francis Richard Lord Wemyss. ( <i>Earl of Wemyss.</i> )
Dayrolles Blakeney Lord Ventry. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )	John Strange Lord Clanbrassill. ( <i>Earl of Roden.</i> )
Henry O'Callaghan Lord Dunalley. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )	Thomas Lord Silchester. ( <i>Earl of Longford.</i> )
Eyre Challoner Henry Lord Clarina. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )	Clotworthy John Eyre Lord Oriskany. ( <i>Viscount Massereene.</i> )
John Henry Lord Loftus. ( <i>Marquess of Ely.</i> )	Hugh Lord Delamere.
William Lord Carysfort. ( <i>Earl of Carysfort.</i> )	Orlando Watkin Weld Lord Forester.
George Ralph Lord Abercromby.	John William Lord Rayleigh.
Charles Towry Hamilton Lord Ellenborough.	Edric Frederic Lord Gifford.
Augustus Frederick Arthur Lord Sandys.	Hubert George Lord Somerhill. ( <i>Marquess of Clanricarde.</i> )
Henry North Lord Sheffield. ( <i>Earl of Sheffield.</i> )	James Ludovic Lord Wigan. ( <i>Earl of Crawford and Balcarres.</i> )
William Macnaghten Lord Erskine.	Uchter John Mark Lord Ranfurly. ( <i>Earl of Ranfurly.</i> )
George John Lord Monteagle. ( <i>Marquess of Sligo.</i> )	John Byrne Leicester Lord De Tabley.
Bernard Arthur William Patrick Hastings Lord Granard. ( <i>Earl of Granard.</i> )	Charles Stuart Henry Lord Tenterden.
Hungerford Lord Crewe.	William Conyngham Lord Plunket.
———— Lord Gardner.	William Frederick Lord Heytesbury.
John Thomas Lord Manners.	Archibald Philip Lord Rosebery. ( <i>Earl of Rosebery.</i> )
John Adrian Louis Lord Hopetoun. ( <i>Earl of Hopetoun.</i> )	Richard James Lord Clanwilliam. ( <i>Earl of Clanwilliam.</i> )
Charles Lord Meldrum. ( <i>Marquess of Huntly.</i> )	William Draper Mortimer Lord Wynford.
Lowry Egerton Lord Grinstead. ( <i>Earl of Enniskillen.</i> )	Charles Gore Lord Kilmarnock. ( <i>Earl of Errol.</i> )
William Hale John Charles Lord Foxford. ( <i>Earl of Limerick.</i> )	Arthur James Francis Lord Fingall. ( <i>Earl of Fingall.</i> )
Victor Albert Francis Charles Lord Churchill.	William Philip Lord Sefton. ( <i>Earl of Sefton.</i> )
George Robert Canning Lord Harris.	Charles Lord Clements. ( <i>Earl of Leitrim.</i> )
Reginald Charles Edward Lord Colchester.	Thomas Lord Kenlis. ( <i>Marquess of Headfort.</i> )
Schomberg Henry Lord Ker. ( <i>Marquess of Lothian.</i> )	Reginald Lord Chaworth. ( <i>Earl of Meath.</i> )
Henry Francis Lord Minster. ( <i>Marquess Conyngham.</i> )	Charles Adolphus Lord Dunmore. ( <i>Earl of Dunmore.</i> )
James Edward William Theobald Lord Ormonde. ( <i>Marquess of Ormonde.</i> )	Augustus Frederick George Warwick Lord Poltimore.
	Llewelyn Nevill Vaughan Lord Mostyn.
	Henry Spencer Lord Templemore.
	Valentine Frederick Lord Cloncurry.
	James St. Vincent Lord De Saumarez.

## ROLL OF THE LORDS

Thomas Lord Denman.	Valentine Augustus Lord Kenmare. ( <i>Earl of Kenmare.</i> ).
James Yorke MacGregor Lord Abinger.	Henry Lord Belper.
Philip Lord De L'Isle and Dudley.	Richard Wogan Lord Talbot de Mala- hide.
Francis Denzil Edward Lord Ashburton.	Robert Lord Ebury.
Edward George Percy Lord Hatherton.	Charles Compton William Lord Ches- ham.
Archibald Brabazon Sparrow Lord Worlingham. ( <i>Earl of Gosford.</i> )	Frederic Augustus Lord Chelmsford.
William Frederick Lord Stratheden.	John Lord Churston.
Geoffrey Dominick Augustus Frederick Lord Oranmore and Browne. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )	Henry Lord Leconfield.
Simon Joseph Lord Lovat.	Wilbraham Lord Egerton.
William Bateman Lord Bateman.	Godfrey Charles Lord Tred gar.
Algernon Hawkins Thomond Lord Kintore. ( <i>Earl of Kintore.</i> )	Fitz Patrick Henry Lord Lyveden.
George Ponsonby Lord Lismore. ( <i>Vis- count Lismore.</i> )	Henry Charles Lord Brougham and Vaux.
Derrick Warner William Lord Ross- more.	Arthur Fitz-Gerald Lord Kinnaird.
Robert Shapland George Julian Lord Carew.	Richard Luttrell Pilkington Lord West- bury.
Charles Frederick Ashley Cooper Lord De Mauley.	Francis William Fitzhardinge Lord Fitz- hardinge.
Arthur Lord Wrottesley.	Luke Lord Annaly.
Charles Douglas Richard Lord Sudeley.	Robert Offley Ashburton Lord Hough- ton.
Paul Sanford Lord Methuen.	John Gaspard Le Marchant Lord Romilly.
Henry Edward John Lord Stanley of Alderley.	James Herbert Gustavus Meredyth Lord Meredyth. ( <i>Lord Athlumney.</i> )
William Henry Lord Leigh.	Windham Thomas Lord Kenry. ( <i>Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl.</i> )
Bailby Lord Wenlock.	Charles Stanley Lord Monck. ( <i>Viscount Monck.</i> )
William Lord Lurgan.	John Major Lord Hartismere. ( <i>Lord Henniker.</i> )
Thomas Spring Lord Monteagle of Brandon.	Hedworth Hylton Lord Hylton.
John Reginald Upton Lord Seaton.	George Sholto Gordon Lord Penrhyn.
John Manley Arbuthnot Lord Keane.	Gustavus Russell Lord Brancepeth. ( <i>Viscount Boyne.</i> )
John Lord Oxenfoord. ( <i>Earl of Stair.</i> )	John Henry Lord Kesteven.
Hussey Crespigny Lord Vivian.	Arthur Lord Ormathwaite.
Henry William Lord Congleton.	Edward Lord O'Neill.
Denis St. George Lord Dunsandle and Clanconal. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )	Robert William Lord Napier.
Victor Alexander Lord Elgin. ( <i>Earl of Elgin and Kincardine.</i> )	Jenico William Joseph Lord Gorman- ston. ( <i>Viscount Gormanston.</i> )
Thomas Montague Morrison Lord Truro.	Thomas Kane Lord Rathdonnell. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )
Arthur Lord De Freyne.	John Hamilton Lord Lawrence.
Edward Burtenshaw Lord Saint Leonards.	
George Fitz-Roy Henry Lord Raglan.	

## SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL.

James Plaisted Lord Penzance.	Charles Wallace Alexander Napier Lord Lamington.
John Lord Dunning. ( <i>Lord Rollo.</i> )	Charles Frederick Lord Donington.
James Lord Balinhard. ( <i>Earl of South- esk.</i> )	Arthur Edwin Lord Trevor.
William Lord Hare. ( <i>Earl of Listowel.</i> )	Montagu William Lord Rowton.
Francis Edward Lord Howard of Glossop.	Edward Hugessen Lord Brabourne.
Bernard Edward Barnaby Lord Castle- town.	Arthur Oliver Villiers Lord Ampthill.
John Emerich Edward Lord Acton.	William Montagu Lord Tweeddale. ( <i>Marquess of Tweeddale.</i> )
Thomas Charles Lord Robartes.	William Ulick Tristram Lord Howth. ( <i>Earl of Howth.</i> )
Frederick Lord Wolverton.	Donald James Lord Reay.
Algernon William Fulke Lord Greville.	Harcourt Lord Derwent.
Thomas Towneley Lord O'Hagan.	Henry James Lord Hothfield.
William Lord Sandhurst.	Dudley Coutts Lord Tweedmouth.
Francis Lord Ettrick. ( <i>Lord Napier.</i> )	Frederick Beauchamp Paget Lord Al- cester.
James Charles Herbert Welbore Ellis Lord Somerton. ( <i>Earl of Normanton.</i> )	Alfred Lord Tennyson.
Henry Austin Lord Aberdare.	James Lord Strathspey. ( <i>Earl of Sea- field.</i> )
James Lord Moncreiff.	John George Lord Monk Bretton.
John Duke Lord Coleridge.	Walter Charles Lord Northbourne.
William Lord Emly.	Arthur Saunders William Charles Fox Lord Sudley. ( <i>Earl of Arran.</i> )
Chichester Samuel Lord Carlingford. ( <i>Lord Clermont.</i> )	John Robert William Lord de Vesci. ( <i>Viscount de Vesci.</i> )
Thomas Francis Lord Cottesloe.	Marmaduke Francis Lord Herries.
John Slaney Lord Hampton.	Hardinge Stanley Lord Halsbury. ( <i>In another Place as Lord High Chancellor.</i> )
Charles Alexander Lord Douglas. ( <i>Earl of Home.</i> )	Mervyn Edward Lord Powerscourt. ( <i>In another Place as Viscount Powerscourt.</i> )
Arthur George Maule Lord Ramsay. ( <i>Earl of Dalhousie.</i> )	Anthony Henley Lord Northington. ( <i>Lord Henley.</i> )
John Henry Lord Fermanagh. ( <i>Earl Erne.</i> )	Nathaniel Mayer Lord Rothschild.
William Richard Lord Harlech.	Edward Charles Lord Revelstoke.
Henry Gerard Lord Alington.	Robert Lord Monkswell.
Wilbraham Frederic Lord Tollemach	Arthur Lord Hobhouse.
William Cansfield Lord Gerard.	Ralph Robert Wheeler Lord Lingen.
Lionel Sackville Lord Sackville.	Edward Lord Ashbourne.
Colin Lord Blackburn.	Rowland Lord Saint Oswald.
Charles Bowyer Lord Norton.	Robert James Lord Wantage.
Percy Lord Shute. ( <i>Viscount Barring- ton.</i> )	William Baliol Lord Esher.
William Lord Watson. ( <i>A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.</i> )	George William Lord Deramore.
Lawrence Hesketh Lord Hald	Henry John Lord Montagu of Beau- lieu.
Ivor Bertie Lord Wimborne.	William Buller Fullerton Lord Elphin- stone.
Arthur Edward Lord Ardilaun.	

# ROLL OF THE LORDS.

Charles John Lord Colville of Culross.	William George Lord Armstrong.
Farrer Lord Herschell.	George Lord Basing.
Charles Henry Lord Hillingdon.	William Henry Lord De Ramsey.
Samuel Charles Lord Hindlip.	William Meriton Lord Cheylesmore.
Edmund Lord Grimthorpe.	Egerton Lord Addington.
Richard de Aquila Lord Stalbridge.	Henry Thurstan Lord Knutsford. ( <i>In another Place as one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State.</i> )
William Lord Kensington.	John Lord Savile.
Michael Arthur Lord Burton.	Michael Lord Morris. ( <i>A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.</i> )
John Glencairn Carter Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.	William Ventris Lord Field.
Thomas Lord Brassey.	Francis Richard Lord Sandford.
Henry Lord Thring.	Edward Cecil Lord Iveagh.
Frederick Arthur Lord Stanley of Preston.	James Lord Hannen. ( <i>A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.</i> )
Edward Lord Macnaghten. ( <i>A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.</i> )	George Lord Mount Stephen.
Robert Lord Connemara.	Samuel Lord Masham.
Claude Lord Bowes. ( <i>In another Place as Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorn.</i> )	Frederick Lord Roberts.
George Edmund Milnes Lord Monckton. ( <i>Viscount Galway.</i> )	Arthur Lord Hood.
John Lord Saint Levan.	William Lord Kelvin.
James Douglas Lord Magheramorne.	Henry John Lord Rookwood.
	Evelyn Lord Cromer.

# LIST OF THE COMMONS.

---

## THE NAMES OF MEMBERS

RETURNED TO SERVE IN THE TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, SUMMONED TO MEET AT WESTMINSTER THE FOURTH DAY OF AUGUST, ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND NINETY TWO, AS BY THE SEVERAL RETURNS FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY APPEARS.

### BEDFORD.

NORTHERN, or BIGGLESWADE DIVISION,  
George William Erskine Russell.

SOUTHERN, or LUTON DIVISION,  
Cyril Flower.

BEDFORD BOROUGH.  
Samuel Whitbread.

### BERKS.

NORTHERN, or ABINGDON DIVISION,  
Philip Wroughton.

SOUTHERN, or NEWBURY DIVISION,  
William George Mount.

EASTERN, or WOKINGHAM DIVISION,  
Sir George Russell, bt.

READING BOROUGH.  
George William Palmer.

WINDSOR (NEW) BOROUGH.  
Francis Tress Barry.

### BUCKS.

NORTHERN, or BUCKINGHAM DIVISION,  
Herbert Samuel Leon.

MID, or AYLESBURY DIVISION,  
Baron Ferdinand James de Rothschild.

SOUTHERN, or WYCOMBE DIVISION,  
Viscount Curzon.

### CAMBRIDGE.

NORTHERN, or WISBECH DIVISION,  
Hon. Arthur George Brand.

WESTERN, or CHESTERTON DIVISION,  
Hugh Edward Hoare.

EASTERN, or NEWMARKET DIVISION,  
George Newnes.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY.  
Richard Claverhouse Jebb.  
Right Hon. Sir John Eldon Gorst.

CAMBRIDGE BOROUGH.  
Robert Uniacke Penrose FitzGerald.

### CHESTER.

WIRRAL DIVISION,  
Lt.-Colonel Edward Thomas Davenant  
Cotton-Jodrell.

EDDISBURY DIVISION,  
Henry James Tollemache.

MACCLESFIELD DIVISION,  
William Bromley-Davenport.

CREWE DIVISION,  
Walter Stowe Bright McLaren.

NORTHWICH DIVISION,  
John Tomlinson Brunner.

ALTRINCHAM DIVISION,  
Coningsby Ralph Disraeli.

**CHESTER—cont.****HYDE DIVISION.**

Joseph Watson Sidebotham.

**KNUTSFORD DIVISION,**

Hon. Alan de Tatton Egerton.

**BIRKENHEAD BOROUGH.**

Viscount Bury.

**CHESTER BOROUGH.**

Robert Armstrong Yerburgh.

**STOCKPORT BOROUGH.**

Joseph Leigh,

Louis John Jennings.

**CORNWALL.****WESTERN, or ST. IVES DIVISION,**

Thomas Bedford Bolitho.

**NORTH - WESTERN, or CAMBORNE DIVISION,**

Charles Augustus Vansittart Conybeare.

**TRURO DIVISION,**

John Charles Williams.

**MID, or ST. AUSTELL DIVISION,**

William Alexander McArthur.

**SOUTH-EASTERN, or BODMIN DIVISION,**

Rt. Hon. Leonard Henry Courtney.

**NORTH-EASTERN, or LAUNCESTON DIVISION,**

Thomas Owen.

**PENRYN AND FALMOUTH BOROUGH.**

William George Cavendish-Bentinck.

**CUMBERLAND.****NORTHERN, or ESKDALE DIVISION,**

Robert Andrew Allison.

**MID, or PENRITH DIVISION,**

James William Lowther.

**COCKERMOUTH DIVISION,**

Sir Wilfrid Lawson, bt.

**WESTERN, or EGREMONT DIVISION,**

David Ainsworth.

**CARLISLE BOROUGH.**

William Court Gully.

**WHITEHAVEN BOROUGH.**

Thomas Shepherd Little.

**DERBY.****HIGH PEAK DIVISION,**

Captain William Sidebottom.

**NORTH-EASTERN DIVISION,**

Thomas Dolling Bolton.

**CHESTERFIELD DIVISION,**

Thomas Bayley.

**WESTERN DIVISION,**

Victor Christian William Cavendish.

**MID DIVISION,**

James Alfred Jacoby.

**ILKESTON DIVISION,**

Sir Balthazar Walter Foster.

**SOUTHERN DIVISION,**

Harrington Evans Broad.

**DERBY BOROUGH.**

Rt. Hon. Sir William George Granville

Venables Vernon Harcourt, kt.,

Thomas Roe.

**DEVON.****EASTERN, or HONITON DIVISION,**

Sir John Henry Kennaway, bt.

**NORTH-EASTERN, or TIVERTON DIVISION,**

Colonel Sir William Hood Walrond, bt.

**NORTHERN, or SOUTH MOLTON DIVISION,**

George Lambert.

**NORTH-WESTERN, or BARNSTAPLE DIVISION,**

Alfred Billson.

**WESTERN, or TAVISTOCK DIVISION,**

Hugh Courtenay Fownes Luttrell.

**SOUTHERN, or TOTNES DIVISION,**

Francis Bingham Mildmay.

**TORQUAY DIVISION,**

Richard Mallock.

**MID, or ASHBURTON DIVISION,**

Charles Seale-Hayne.

**DEVONPORT BOROUGH.**

Hudson E. Kearley.

Edward J. C. Morton.

**EXETER BOROUGH.**

Hon. Sir Henry Stafford Northcote, bt.,

C.B.

**PLYMOUTH BOROUGH.**

Sir Edward George Clarke, kt.,

Sir William George Pearce.

**DORSET.**

NORTHERN DIVISION,  
John Kenelm Digby Wingfield-Digby.

EASTERN DIVISION,  
Hon. Humphrey Napier Sturt.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,  
William Ernest Brymer.

WESTERN DIVISION,  
Henry Richard Farquharson.

**DURHAM.**

JARROW DIVISION,  
Sir Charles Mark Palmer, bt.

HOUGHTON-LE-SPRING DIVISION,  
Captain Henry Thomas Fenwick.

CHESTER-LE-STREET DIVISION,  
James Joicey.

NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,  
Llewellyn Archer Atherley-Jones.

MID DIVISION,  
John Wilson.

SOUTH-EASTERN DIVISION,  
Joseph Richardson.

BISHOP AUCKLAND DIVISION,  
James Mellor Paulton.

BARNARD CASTLE DIVISION,  
Sir Joseph Whitwell Pease, bt.

DARLINGTON BOROUGH.  
Theodore Fry.

DURHAM BOROUGH.  
Matthew A. Fowler.

GATESHEAD BOROUGH.  
Hon. Walter Henry James.

HARTLEPOOLS (THE) BOROUGH.  
Christopher Furness.

SOUTH SHIELDS BOROUGH.  
James Cochran Stevenson.

STOCKTON BOROUGH.  
Thomas Wrightson.

SUNDERLAND BOROUGH.  
Samuel Storey,  
Edward Temperley Gourley.

**ESSEX.**

SOUTH-WESTERN, or WALTHAMSTOW  
DIVISION,

Edmund Widdrington Byrne.

SOUTHERN, or ROMFORD DIVISION,  
James Theobald.

WESTERN, or EPPING DIVISION,  
Lt.-Col. Amelius Richard Mark Lockwood.

NORTHERN, or SAFFRON WAL  
DIVISION,

Herbert Colstoun Gardner.

NORTH-EASTERN, or HARWICH DIVISION,  
James Round.

EASTERN, or MALDON DIVISION,  
Cyril Joseph Settle Dodd.

MID, or CHELMSFORD DIVISION,  
Thomas Usborne.

SOUTH-EASTERN DIVISION,  
Major Frederic Carne Rasch.

COLCHESTER BOROUGH.  
Captain Herbert S. Naylor-Leyland.

WEST HAM BOROUGH.  
*North Division,*  
Thomas Newcomen Archibald Grove.

*South Division,*  
James Keir Hardie.

**GLOUCESTER.**

MID, or STROUD DIVISION,  
David Brynmor Jones.

NORTHERN, or TEWKESBURY DIVISION,  
Sir John Edward Dorington, bt.

EASTERN, or CIRENCESTER DIVISION,  
Arthur Brend Winterbotham.

FOREST OF DEAN DIVISION,  
Rt. hon. Sir Charles Wentworth  
Dilke, bt.

SOUTHERN, or THORNBURY DIVISION,  
Charles Edward Hungerford Athole  
Colston.

BRISTOL BOROUGH.  
*West Division,*  
Rt. hon. Sir Michael Edward Hicks.  
Beach, bt.



**GLOUCESTER—cont.***North Division,*

Charles Townsend.

*East Division,*

Sir Joseph Dodge Weston.

*South Division,*

Colonel Sir Edward Stock Hill, K.C.B.

**CHELTENHAM BOROUGH.**

James Tynte Agg-Gardner.

**GLOUCESTER BOROUGH.**

Thomas Robinson.

**HANTS.**NORTHERN, or BASINGSTOKE DIVISION,  
Arthur Frederick Jeffreys.WESTERN, or ANDOVER DIVISION,  
William Wither Bramston Beach.EASTERN, or PETERSFIELD DIVISION,  
William Wickham.SOUTHERN, or FAREHAM DIVISION,  
General Sir Frederick Wellington John  
FitzWygram, bt.NEW FOREST DIVISION,  
Hon. John Walter Edward D. Scott-  
Montagu.**CHRISTCHURCH BOROUGH.**  
Abel Henry Smith.**PORTSMOUTH BOROUGH.**John Baker,  
Walter Owen Clough.**SOUTHAMPTON BOROUGH.**  
Tankerville Chamberlayne,  
Francis Henry Evans.**WINCHESTER BOROUGH.**  
William Henry Myers.**HEREFORD.**NORTHERN, or LEOMINSTER DIVISION,  
James Rankin.SOUTHERN, or ROSS DIVISION,  
Michael Biddulph.**HEREFORD BOROUGH.**  
William Henry Grenfell.**HERTFORD.**NORTHERN, or HITCHIN DIVISION,  
George Bickersteth Hudson.EASTERN, or HERTFORD DIVISION,  
Abel Smith.MID, or ST. ALBAN'S DIVISION,  
Vicary Gibbs.WESTERN, or WATFORD DIVISION,  
Thomas Frederick Halsey.**HUNTINGDON.**SOUTHERN, or HUNTINGDON DIVISION,  
Arthur Hugh Smith-Barry.NORTHERN, or RAMSEY DIVISION,  
Hon. Ailwyn Edward Fellowes.**ISLE OF WIGHT.**

Sir Richard Everard Webster, kt.

**KENT.**WESTERN, or SEVENOAKS DIVISION,  
Henry William Forster.NORTH-WESTERN, or DARTFORD  
DIVISION,  
Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart Dyke, bt.SOUTH-WESTERN, or TUNBRIDGE  
DIVISION,  
Arthur S. T. Griffith-Boscawen.MID, or MEDWAY DIVISION,  
Major Charles Edward Warde.NORTH-EASTERN, or FAVERSHAM  
DIVISION,  
Hon. Herbert Thomas Knatchbull-  
Hugessen.SOUTHERN, or ASHFORD DIVISION,  
Laurence Hardy.EASTERN, or ST. AUGUSTINE'S DIVISION,  
Rt. Hon. Aretas Akers-Douglas.ISLE OF THANET DIVISION,  
Rt. Hon. James Lowther.**CANTERBURY BOROUGH.**  
John Henniker Heaton.

**KENT—cont.****CHATHAM BOROUGH.**

Colonel Lewis Vivian Loyd.

**DEPTFORD BOROUGH.**

Charles John Darling.

**DOVER BOROUGH.**

George Wyndham.

**GRAVESEND BOROUGH.**

James Dampier Palmer.

**GREENWICH BOROUGH.**

Thomas William Boord.

**HYTHE BOROUGH.**

Sir Edward William Watkin, bt.

**LEWISHAM BOROUGH.**

John Penn.

**MAIDSTONE BOROUGH.**

Francis Stanley Wykeham Cornwallis.

**ROCHESTER BOROUGH.**

Horatio David Davies.

**WOOLWICH BOROUGH.**

Colonel Edwin Hughes.

**LANCASTER.****North Lancashire.****NORTH LONSDALE DIVISION,**

William Smith.

**LANCASTER DIVISION,**

James Williamson.

**BLACKPOOL DIVISION,**

Sir Matthew White Ridley, bt.

**CHORLEY DIVISION,**Lieut.-General Randle Joseph Feilden,  
C.M.G.**North-East Lancashire.****DARWEN DIVISION,**

Charles Philip Huntington.

**CLITHEROE DIVISION,**Rt. Hon. Sir Ughtred James Kay-  
Shuttleworth, bt.**ACCRINGTON DIVISION,**

Joseph Francis Leese.

**ROSSENDALE DIVISION,**

John Henry Maden.

**LANCASTER—cont.****South-East Lancashire.****WESTHOUGHTON DIVISION,**

Hon. Edward George Villiers Stanley.

**HEYWOOD DIVISION,**

Thomas Snape.

**MIDDLETON DIVISION,**

Charles Henry Hopwood.

**RADCLIFFE-CUM-FARNWORTH DIVISION,**  
Robert Leake.**ECCLES DIVISION,**

Henry John Roby.

**STRET福德 DIVISION,**

John William Maclure.

**GORTON DIVISION,**

William Mather.

**PRESTWICH DIVISION,**

Robert Gray Cornish Mowbray.

**South-West Lancashire.****SOUTHPORT DIVISION,**

Hon. George Nathaniel Curzon.

**ORMSKIRK DIVISION,**

Right Hon. Arthur Bower Forwood.

**BOOTLE DIVISION.**

Colonel Thomas Myles Sandys.

**WIDNES DIVISION,**

John Saunders Gilliat.

**NEWTON DIVISION,**

Thomas Wodehouse Legh.

**INCE DIVISION,**

Samuel Woods.

**LEIGH DIVISION,**

Caleb Wright.

**ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE BOROUGH.**

John Edmund Wentworth Addison.

**BARROW-IN-FURNESS BOROUGH.**

Charles William Cayzer.

**BLACKBURN BOROUGH.**

William Henry Hornby,

William Coddington.

*List of*

{COMMONS, 1892}

*Members.*

LANCASTER—*cont.*

BOLTON BOROUGH.

Herbert Shepherd-Cross,  
Colonel Hon. Francis Charles Bridge-  
man.

BURNLEY BOROUGH.

Jabez Spencer Balfour.

BURY BOROUGH.

Right Hon. Sir Henry James, kt.

LIVERPOOL BOROUGH.

*Kirkdale Division,*

Sir George Smyth Baden-Powell,  
K.C.M.G.

*Walton Division,*

James Henry Stock.

*Everton Division,*

John Archibald Willox.

*West Derby Division,*

Hon. William Henry Cross.

*Scotland Division,*

Thomas Power O'Connor.

*Exchange Division,*

Ralph Neville.

*Abercromby Division,*

William Frederick Lawrence.

*East Toxteth Division,*

Rt. Hon. Baron Henry de Worms.

*West Toxteth Division,*

R. P. Houston.

MANCHESTER BOROUGH.

*North-West Division,*

Sir William Henry Houldsworth, bt.

*North Division,*

Charles Ernest Schwann.

*North-East Division,*

Right Hon. Sir James Fergusson, bt.,  
G.C.S.I.

*East Division,*

Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour.

*South Division,*

Sir Henry Enfield Roscoe, kt.

*South-West Division,*

Jacob Bright.

LANCASTER—*cont.*

OLDHAM BOROUGH.

Joshua Milne Cheetham,  
Rt. Hon. John Tomlinson Hibbert.

PRESTON BOROUGH.

Robert William Hanbury,  
William Edward Murray Tomlinson.

ROCHDALE BOROUGH.

Thomas Bayley Potter.

SALFORD BOROUGH.

*North Division,*

William H. Holland.

*West Division,*

Lees Knowles.

*South Division,*

Sir Henry Hoyle Howorth.

ST. HELENS BOROUGH.

Henry Seton-Karr.

STALYBRIDGE BOROUGH.

Tom Harrop Sidebottom.

WARRINGTON BOROUGH.

Robert Pierpoint.

WIGAN BOROUGH.

Sir Francis Sharp Powell, bt.

LEICESTER.

EASTERN, or MELTON DIVISION,  
Marquess of Granby.

MID, or LOUGHBOROUGH DIVISION,  
Jabez Edward Johnson-Ferguson.

WESTERN, or BOSWORTH DIVISION,  
Charles Benjamin Bright McLaren.

SOUTHERN, or HARBOROUGH DIVISION,  
John William Logan.

LEICESTER BOROUGH.

James Allanson Picton,  
Sir James Whitehead, bt.

## LINCOLN.

WEST LINDSEY, or GAINSBORO'  
DIVISION.

Joseph Bennett.

NORTH LINDSEY, or BRIGG DIVISION,  
Samuel Danks Waddy.EAST LINDSEY, or LOUTH DIVISION,  
Robert William Perks.SOUTH LINDSEY, or HORNCASTLE  
DIVISION,  
Right Hon Edward Stanhope.NORTH KESTEVEN, or SLEAFORD  
DIVISION.  
Right Hon. Henry Chaplin.SOUTH KESTEVEN, or STAMFORD  
DIVISION,  
Henry John Cokayne Cust.HOLLAND, or SPALDING DIVISION,  
Halley Stewar.BOSTON BOROUGH.  
William James Ingram.GRANTHAM BOROUGH.  
Henry Yarde Buller Lopes.GREAT GRIMSBY BOROUGH.  
Henri Josse.LINCOLN BOROUGH.  
William Crosfield.

## MIDDLESEX.

ENFIELD DIVISION,  
Captain Henry Ferryman Bowles.TOTTENHAM DIVISION.  
Joseph Howard.HORNSEY DIVISION,  
Henry Charles Stephens.HARROW DIVISION,  
William Ambrose.EALING DIVISION,  
Rt. Hon. Lord George Francis Hamilton.BRENTFORD DIVISION,  
James Bigwood.UXBRIDGE DIVISION,  
Frederick Dixon Dixon-Hartland.

## MIDDLESEX—cont.

## BETHNAL GREEN BOROUGH.

*North-East Division,*  
George Howell.*South-West Division,*  
Edward Hare Pickersgill.CHELSEA BOROUGH.  
Charles Algernon Whitmore.FINSBURY BOROUGH.  
*Holborn Division,*  
Sir Charles Hall.*Central Division,*  
Dadabhai Naoroji.*East Division,*  
James Rowlands.FULHAM BOROUGH.  
William Hayes Fisher.HACKNEY BOROUGH.  
*North Division,*  
William Robert Bouasfield.*Central Division,*  
Sir Andrew Richard Scoble, K.C.S.I.*South Division,*  
Sir Charles Russell, kt.HAMMERSMITH BOROUGH.  
Major-General Walter Tuckfield Golds-  
worthy.HAMPSTEAD BOROUGH.  
Edward Brodie Hoare.ISLINGTON BOROUGH.  
*North Division,*  
George Christopher Trout Bartley.*West Division,*  
Thomas Lough.*East Division,*  
Benjamin Louis Cohen.*South Division,*  
Sir Albert Kaye Rollit, kt.KENSINGTON BOROUGH.  
*North Division,*  
Frederick Charlwood Frye.

*List of*

{COMMONS, 1892}

*Members.*

**MIDDLESEX—Kensington Boro'—cont.**

*South Division,*

Sir Algernon Borthwick, bt.

LONDON UNIVERSITY.

Rt. Hon. Sir John Lubbock, bt.

MARYLEBONE BOROUGH.

*East Division,*

Edmund Boulnois.

*West Division,*

Frederick Seager Hunt.

PADDINGTON BOROUGH.

*North Division,*

John Aird.

*South Division,*

Rt. Hon. Lord Randolph Henry Spencer Churchill.

ST. GEORGE'S, HANOVER SQUARE.

Rt. Hon. George Joachim Goschen.

ST. PANCRAS BOROUGH.

*North Division,*

Thomas Henry Bolton.

*East Division,*

Robert Grant Webster.

*West Division,*

Henry Robert Graham.

*South Division,*

Sir Julian Goldsmid, bt.

SHOREDITCH BOROUGH.

*Hoxton Division,*

James Stuart.

*Haggerston Division,*

William Randal Cremer.

STRAND BOROUGH.

Hon. William Frederick Danvers Smith.

TOWER HAMLETS BOROUGH.

*Whitechapel Division,*

Samuel Montagu.

*St. George's Division,*

John Williams Benn.

*Limehouse Division,*

John Stewart Wallace.

*Mile End Division,*

Spencer Charrington.

**MIDDLESEX—Tower Hamlets Boro'—cont.**

*Stepney Division,*

Frederick Wootton Isaacson.

*Bow and Bromley Division,*

John Archibald Murray Macdonald.

*Poplar Division,*

Sydney Charles Buxton.

WESTMINSTER BOROUGH.

William Lehmann Ashmead-Bartlett  
Burdett-Coutts.

LONDON CITY.

Sir Reginald Hanson, bt.,

Alban George Henry Gibbs.

MONMOUTH.

NORTHERN DIVISION,

Captain Thomas Phillips Price.

WESTERN DIVISION,

Cornelius Marshall Warmington.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,

Col. Hon. Frederick Courtenay Morgan.

MONMOUTH BOROUGH.

Albert Spicer.

NORFOLK.

NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,

Joseph Arch.

SOUTH-WESTERN DIVISION,

Thomas Leigh Hare.

NORTHERN DIVISION,

Herbert Hardy Cozens-Hardy.

EASTERN DIVISION,

Robert John Price.

MID DIVISION,

Clement Higgins.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,

Francis Taylor.

GREAT YARMOUTH BOROUGH.

James Marshall Moorsom.

KING'S LYNN BOROUGH.

Thomas Gibson Bowles.

NORWICH BOROUGH.

Samuel Hoare,

Jeremiah James Colman.

**NORTHAMPTON.**

NORTHERN DIVISION,  
Rt. Hon. Lord Burghley.

EASTERN DIVISION,  
Francis Allston Channing.

MID DIVISION,  
Hon. Charles Robert Spencer.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,  
David C. Guthrie.

NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH.  
Henry Labouchere,  
Moses Philip Manfield.

PETERBOROUGH BOROUGH.  
Alpheus Cleophas Morton.

---

**NORTHUMBERLAND.**

WANSBECK DIVISION,  
Charles Fenwick.

TYNESIDE DIVISION,  
Joseph Albert Pease.

HEXHAM DIVISION,  
Nathaniel George Clayton.

BERWICK-UPON-TWEED DIVISION,  
Sir Edward Grey, bt.

MORPETH BOROUGH.  
Thomas Burt.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE BOROUGH.  
Charles Frederick Hamond,  
Right Hon. John Morley.

TYNEMOUTH BOROUGH.  
Richard Sim Donkin.

---

**NOTTINGHAM.**

BASSETLAW DIVISION,  
Sir Frederick George Milner, bt.

NEWARK DIVISION,  
Viscount Newark.

RUSHCLIFFE DIVISION,  
John Edward Ellis.

MANSFIELD DIVISION,  
John Carvell Williams.

NOTTINGHAM BOROUGH.  
*West Division,*  
Colonel Charles Seely.

*East Division,*  
Arnold Morley.

*South Division,*  
Henry Smith Wright.

**OXFORD.**

NORTHERN, or BANBURY DIVISION,  
Sir Bernhard Samuelson, bt.

MID, or WOODSTOCK DIVISION,  
Godfrey Rathbone Benson.

SOUTHERN, or HENLEY DIVISION,  
Hon. Francis Parker.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY.  
Rt. Hon. Sir John Robert Mowbray,  
bt., D.C.L.  
John Gilbert Talbot, D.C.L.

OXFORD BOROUGH.  
Lieut.-General Sir George T. Chesney,  
K.C.B., C.S.I., C.I.E., R.E.

---

**RUTLAND.**

George Henry Finch.

---

**SALOP.**

WESTERN, or OSWESTRY DIVISION,  
Stanley Leighton.

NORTHERN, or NEWPORT DIVISION,  
Col. William Slaney Kenyon-Slaney.

MID, or WELLINGTON DIVISION.  
Alexander Hargreaves Brown.

SOUTHERN, or LUDLOW DIVISION,  
Robert Jasper More.

SHREWSBURY BOROUGH.  
Henry David Greene.

---

**SOMERSET.**

NORTHERN DIVISION,  
Thomas Courtenay T. Warner.

WELLS DIVISION,  
Colonel Sir Richard Horner Paget, bt.

FROME DIVISION.  
John Emmott Barlow.

EASTERN DIVISION,  
Henry Hobhouse.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,  
Edward Strachey.

BRIDGWATER DIVISION,  
Edward James Stanley.

WESTERN, or WELLINGTON DIVISION.  
Capt. Sir Alexander F. Acland-Hood, bt.

*List of*

## {COMMONS, 1892}

*Members.***SOMERSET—cont.****BATH BOROUGH.**

Colonel Charles Wyndham Murray,  
Edmond Robert Wodehouse.

**TAUNTON BOROUGH.**

Hon. Alfred Percy Allsopp.

**STAFFORD.****LEEK DIVISION,**

Charles Bill.

**BURTON DIVISION,**

Sydney Evershed.

**WESTERN DIVISION,**

Hamar Alfred Bass.

**NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,**

James Heath.

**LICHFIELD DIVISION,**

Major Leonard Darwin.

**KINGSWINFORD DIVISION,**

Alexander Staveley Hill.

**HANDSWORTH DIVISION,**

Sir Henry Meysey Meysey-Thompson, bt.

**HANLEY BOROUGH.**

William Woodall.

**NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME BOROUGH.**

William S. Allen.

**STAFFORD BOROUGH.**

Charles Edward Shaw.

**STOKE-UPON-TRENT BOROUGH.**

Hon. George Granville Leveson-Gower.

**WALSALL BOROUGH.**

Frank James.

**WEDNESBURY BOROUGH.**

Wilson Lloyd.

**WEST BROMWICH BOROUGH.**

James Ernest Spencer.

**WOLVERHAMPTON BOROUGH.***West Division,*

Sir Alfred Hickman.

*East Division,*

Rt. Hon. Henry Hartley Fowler.

*South Division,*

Rt. Hon. Charles Pelham Villiers.

**SUFFOLK.**

NORTHERN, or LOWESTOFT DIVISION,  
Harry Seymour Foster.

NORTH-EASTERN, or EYE DIVISION,  
Francis Seymour Stevenson.

NORTH-WESTERN, or STOWMARKET  
DIVISION,  
Sydney James Stern.

SOUTH, or SUDBURY DIVISION,  
William Cuthbert Quilter.

SOUTH-EASTERN, or WOODBRIDGE  
DIVISION,  
Robert Lacey Everett.

BURY ST. EDMUNDS BOROUGH.  
Lord Francis Hervey.

IPSWICH BOROUGH.  
Sir Charles Dalrymple, bt.,  
Lord Elcho.

**SURREY.**

NORTH-WESTERN, or CHERTSEY  
DIVISION,  
Charles Harvey Combe.

SOUTH-WESTERN, or GUILDFORD  
DIVISION,  
Hon. William St. John Fremantle  
Brodrick.

SOUTH-EASTERN, or REIGATE DIVISION,  
Henry Cubitt.

MID, or EPSOM DIVISION,  
Thomas Townsend Bucknill.

KINGSTON DIVISION,  
Sir Richard Temple, bt., G.C.S.I.

NORTH-EASTERN, or WIMBLEDON  
DIVISION,  
Henry Cosmo Orme Bonsor.

BATTERSEA AND CLAPHAM BOROUGH.  
*Battersea Division,*  
John Burns.

*Clapham Division,*  
Percy M. Thornton.

SURREY—*cont.*

## CAMBERWELL BOROUGH.

*North Division,*

Edward Hodson Bayley.

*Peckham Division,*

Frederick George Banbury.

*Dulwich Division,*

John Blundell Maple.

## CROYDON BOROUGH.

Hon. Sidney Herbert.

## LAMBETH BOROUGH.

*North Division,*

Francis Moses Coldwells.

*Kennington Division,*

Mark Hanbury Beaufoy.

*Brixton Division,*

Marquess of Carmarthen.

*Norwood Division,*

Charles Ernest Tritton.

## NEWINGTON BOROUGH.

*West Division,*

Captain Cecil William Norton.

*Waltham Division,*

William Saunders.

## SOUTHWARK BOROUGH.

*West Division,*

Richard Knight Causton.

*Rotherhithe Division,*

John Cumming Macdonald.

*Bermondsey Division,*

Reuben V. Barrow.

## WANDSWORTH BOROUGH.

Henry Kimber.

## SUSSEX.

## NORTH-WESTERN, or HORSHAM DIVISION,

Right Hon. Sir Walter Barttelot Barttelot,  
bt., C.B.SOUTH-WESTERN, or CHICHESTER  
DIVISION,

Rt. Hon. Lord Walter C. Gordon Lennox.

## NORTHERN, or EAST GRINSTEAD DIVISION,

Hon. Alfred Erskine Gathorne-Hardy.

SUSSEX—*cont.*

## MID, or LEWES DIVISION,

Sir Henry Fletcher, bt.

## SOUTHERN, or EASTBOURNE DIVISION,

Admiral Edward Field.

## EASTERN, or RYE DIVISION,

Arthur Montagu Brookfield.

## BRIGHTON BOROUGH.

Gerald Walter Erskine Loder,

Rt. Hon. Sir William Thackeray Mar-  
riott, kt.

## HASTINGS BOROUGH.

Wilson Noble.

## WARWICK.

## NORTHERN, or TAMWORTH DIVISION,

Philip Albert Muntz.

## NORTH-EASTERN, or NUNEATON DIVISION,

Francis Alexander Newdigate.

## SOUTH-WESTERN, or STRATFORD-ON-

## AVON DIVISION,

Algernon Bertram Freeman-Mitford.

## SOUTH-EASTERN, or RUGBY DIVISION,

Henry Peyton Cobb.

## ASTON MANOR BOROUGH.

Captain George William Grice-Hutchin-  
son.

## BIRMINGHAM BOROUGH.

*Edgbaston Division,*

George Dixon.

*West Division,*

Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain.

*Central Division,*

John Albert Bright.

*North Division,*

William Kenrick.

*East Division,*

Right Hon. Henry Matthews.

*Bordesley Division,*

Jesse Collings.

*South Division,*

Joseph Powell-Williams.



**WARWICK—cont.****COVENTRY BOROUGH.**

William Henry Walter Ballantine.

**WARWICK & LEAMINGTON BOROUGH.**

Rt. Hon. Arthur Wellesley Peel.

**WESTMORELAND.**

**NORTHERN, or APPLEBY DIVISION,**  
Sir Joseph Savory, bt.

**SOUTHERN, or KENDAL DIVISION,**  
Captain Josceline FitzRoy Bagot.

**WILTS.**

**NORTHERN, or CRICKLADE DIVISION,**  
John Husband.

**NORTH-WESTERN, or CHIPPENHAM  
DIVISION,**  
Sir John Poynder Dickson-Poynder, bt.

**WESTERN, or WESTBURY DIVISION,**  
George Pargiter Fuller.

**EASTERN, or DEVIZES DIVISION,**  
Charles Edward Henry Hobhouse.

**SOUTHERN, or WILTON DIVISION,**  
Viscount Folkestone.

**SALISBURY BOROUGH.**

Edward Henry Hulse.

**WORCESTER.**

**WESTERN, or BEWDLEY DIVISION,**  
Alfred Baldwin.

**SOUTHERN, or EVESHAM DIVISION,**  
Sir Edmund Anthony Harley Lech-  
mere, bt.

**MID, or DROITWICH DIVISION,**  
Richard Biddulph Martin.

**NORTHERN, or OLDBURY DIVISION,**  
Benjamin Hingley.

**EASTERN DIVISION,**  
J. Austen Chamberlain.

**DUDLEY BOROUGH.**  
Brooke Robinson.

**KIDDERMINSTER BOROUGH.**  
Augustus Frederick Godson.

**WORCESTER BOROUGH.**  
Hon. George Higginson Allsopp.

**YORK.****North Riding,**

**THIRSK AND MALTON DIVISION,**  
John Grant Lawson.

**RICHMOND DIVISION,**  
George William Elliot.

**CLEVELAND DIVISION,**  
Henry Fell Pease.

**WHITEBY DIVISION,**  
Ernest William Beckett.

**East Riding,**

**HOLDERNESS DIVISION,**  
Commander George Richard Bethell, R.N.

**BUCKROSE DIVISION,**  
Angus Holden.

**HOWDENSHERE DIVISION,**  
Colonel William H. Wilson-Todd.

**West Riding, Northern Part,**  
**SKIPTON DIVISION,**  
Charles Savile Roundell.

**KEIGHLEY DIVISION,**  
Isaac Holden.

**SHIPLEY DIVISION,**  
William Pollard Byles.

**SOWERBY DIVISION,**  
Right Hon. John William Mellor.

**ELLAND DIVISION,**  
Thomas Wayman.

**West Riding, Southern Part,**  
**MORLEY DIVISION,**  
Alfred Eddison Hutton.

**NORMANTON DIVISION,**  
Benjamin Pickard.

**COLNE VALLEY DIVISION,**  
Sir James B. Kitson, bt.

**HOLMFIRTH DIVISION,**  
Henry Joseph Wilson.

**BARNSELY DIVISION,**  
Earl Compton.

**HALLAMSHIRE DIVISION,**  
Sir Frederick Thorpe Mappin, bt.

YORK—*cont.*

ROTHERHAM DIVISION,  
Arthur Herbert Dyke Acland.

DONCASTER DIVISION,  
Charles James Fleming.

West Riding, Eastern Part,  
RIPON DIVISION,  
John Lloyd Wharton.

OTLEY DIVISION,  
John Barran.

BARKSTON ASH DIVISION,  
Colonel Robert Gunter.

OSGOLDCROSS DIVISION,  
John Austin.

PUDSEY DIVISION,  
Briggs Priestley.

SPEN VALLEY DIVISION,  
Thomas Palmer Whittaker.

BRADFORD BOROUGH.  
*West Division,*  
Alfred Illingworth.

*Central Division,*  
Right Hon. John George Shaw Lefevre.

*East Division,*  
William Sproston Caine.

DEWSBURY BOROUGH.  
Mark Oldroyd.

HALIFAX BOROUGH.  
Thomas Shaw,  
Rt. Hon. James Stansfeld.

HUDDERSFIELD BOROUGH.  
William Summers.

KINGSTON-UPON-HULL BOROUGH.  
*East Division,*  
Clarence Smith.

*Central Division,*  
Henry Seymour King.

*West Division,*  
Charles Henry Wilson.

LEEDS BOROUGH.  
*North Division,*  
Right Hon. William Lawies Jackson.

YORK—*cont.*

*Central Division,*  
Gerald William Balfour.

*East Division,*  
John Lawrence Gane.

*West Division,*  
Herbert John Gladstone.

*South Division,*  
Rt. Hon. Sir Lyon Playfair, K.C.B.

MIDDLESBROUGH BOROUGH.  
Joseph Havelock Wilson.

PONTEFRAC T BOROUGH.  
Hon. Rowland Winn.

SCARBOROUGH BOROUGH.  
Sir George Reresby Sitwell, bt.

SHEFFIELD BOROUGH.  
*Attercliffe Division,*  
Hon. Bernard John Seymour Coleridge.

*Brightside Division,*  
Rt. Hon. Anthony John Mundella.

*Central Division,*  
Colonel Charles Edward Howard Vincent, C.B.

*Hallam Division,*  
Charles Beilby Stuart-Wortley.

*Ecclesall Division,*  
Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett.

WAKEFIELD BOROUGH.  
Albany H. Charlesworth.

YORK BOROUGH.  
John George Butcher,  
Frank Lockwood.

## WALES.

## ANGLESEA.

Thomas P. Lewis.

## BRECKNOCK.

William Fuller Maitland.

## CARDIGAN.

William Bowen Rowlands.

*List of*

{COMMONS, 1892}

*Members.*

CARMARTHEN.

EASTERN DIVISION,

Abel Thomas.

WESTERN DIVISION,

John Lloyd Morgan.

CARMARTHEN BOROUGH.

Major Evan Rowland Jones.

CARNARVON.

SOUTHERN OR EIFION DIVISION,

John Bryn Roberts.

NORTHERN OR ARFON DIVISION,

William Rathbone.

CARNARVON BOROUGH.

David Lloyd-George.

DENBIGH.

EASTERN DIVISION,

Rt. Hon. George Osborne Morgan.

WESTERN DIVISION,

John Herbert Roberts.

DENBIGH BOROUGH.

Hon. George Thomas Kenyon.

FLINT.

Samuel Smith.

FLINT BOROUGH.

John Herbert Lewis.

GLAMORGAN.

EASTERN DIVISION,

Alfred Thomas.

RHONDDA DIVISION,

William Abraham.

WESTERN OR GOWER DIVISION,

Daniel David Randell.

MID DIVISION,

Samuel Thomas Evans.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,

Arthur John Williams.

CARDIFF BOROUGH.

Sir Edward James Reed, K.C.B.

MERTHYR TYDVIL BOROUGH.

David Alfred Thomas,

William Pritchard Morgan.

SWANSEA BOROUGH.

*Swansea, Town,*

Robert John Dickson Burnie.

*Swansea, District,*

Sir Henry Hussey Vivian, bt.

MERIONETH.

Thomas Edward Ellis.

MONTGOMERY.

Stuart Rendel.

MONTGOMERY BOROUGH.

Sir Pryce Pryce-Jones.

PEMBROKE.

William Rees Morgan Davies.

PEMBROKE AND HAVERFORDWEST  
BOROUGH.

Charles Francis Egerton Allen.

RADNOR.

Frank Edwards.

---

SCOTLAND.

ABERDEEN.

EASTERN DIVISION,

Peter Esslemont.

WESTERN DIVISION,

Robert Farquharson, M.D.

ABERDEEN BURGH.

*North Division,*

William Alexander Hunter.

*South Division,*

James Bryce.

ARGYLL.

Donald Horne Macfarlane.

AYR.

NORTHERN DIVISION,

Hon. Thomas Horatio Arthur Ernest  
Cochrane.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,

Eugene Wason.

AYR DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

William Birkmyre.

KILMARNOCK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Stephen Williamson.

*List of*

## {COMMONS, 1892}

*Members.***BANFF.**

Robert William Duff.

**BERWICK.**

Right Hon. Edward Marjoribanks.

**BUTE.**

Andrew Graham Murray.

**CAITHNESS.**

Gavin Brown Clark, M.D.

**WICK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.**

Sir John Pender.

**CLACKMANNAN AND KINROSS.**

Rt. Hon. John Blair Balfour.

**DUMBARTON.**

Captain John Sinclair.

**DUMFRIES.**

William Jardine Maxwell.

**DUMFRIES DISTRICT OF BURGHS.**

Robert Threshie Reid.

**EDINBURGH (MID LoTHIAN).**

Rt. Hon. William Ewart Gladstone.

**EDINBURGH BURGHS.***East Division,*

Robert Wallace.

*West Division,*

Viscount Wolmer.

*Central Division,*

William McEwan.

*South Division,*

Herbert Woodfield Paul.

**EDINBURGH AND ST. ANDREWS UNIVERSITIES.**

Rt. Hon. Sir Charles John Pearson, kt.

**LEITH DISTRICT OF BURGHS.**

Ronald Crawford Munro Ferguson.

**ELGIN AND NAIRN.**

John Seymour Keay.

**ELGIN DISTRICT OF BURGHS.**

Alexander Asher.

**FIFE.****EASTERN DIVISION,**

Herbert Henry Asquith.

**WESTERN DIVISION,**

Augustine Birrell.

**KIRKCALDY DISTRICT OF BURGHS.**

James Henry Dalziel.

**ST. ANDREWS DISTRICT OF BURGHS.**

Henry Torrens Anstruther.

**FORFAR.**

John Rigby.

**DUNDEE BURGHS.**

John Leng,

Edmund Robertson.

**MONTROSE DISTRICT OF BURGHS.**

John Shiress Will.

**HADDINGTON.**

Richard Burdon Haldane.

**INVERNESS.**

Donald Macgregor, M.D.

**INVERNESS DISTRICT OF BURGHS.**

Gilbert Beith.

**KINCARDINE.**

John William Crombie.

**KIRKCUDBRIGHT.**

Mark John Stewart.

**LANARK.****GOVAN DIVISION,**

John Wilson.

**PARTICK DIVISION,**

James Parker Smith.

**NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,**

Graeme Alexander Whitelaw.

**NORTH-EASTERN DIVISION,**

Donald Crawford.

**MID-DIVISION,**

John Wynford Philipps.

**SOUTHERN DIVISION.**

James Henry Cecil Hozier.

LANARK—*cont.*

## GLASGOW BOROUGH.

*Bridgeton Division.*

Rt. Hon. Sir George Otto Trevelyan, bt.

*Camlachie Division,*

Alexander Cross.

*St. Rollox Division,*

Sir James M. Carmichael, bt.

*Central Division,*

John George Alexander Baird.

*College Division,*

Charles Cameron, M.D., LL.D.

*Tradeston Division,*

Archibald Cameron Corbett.

*Blackfriars and Hutchesontown Division,*

Andrew Dryburgh Provand.

GLASGOW AND ABERDEEN  
UNIVERSITIES.

James Alexander Campbell, LL.D.

## LINLITHGOW.

Peter McLagan.

## ORKNEY AND SHETLAND.

Leonard Lyell.

## PEEBLES AND SELKIRK.

Walter Thorburn.

## PERTH.

## EASTERN DIVISION,

Sir John George Smyth Kinloch, bt.

## WESTERN DIVISION,

Sir Donald Currie, K.C.M.G.

## PERTH BURGH.

William Whitelaw.

## RENFREW.

## EASTERN DIVISION,

Michael Hugh Shaw-Stewart.

## WESTERN DIVISION,

Charles Bine Renshaw.

## GREENOCK BURGH.

Sir Thomas Sutherland, K.C.M.G.

## PAISLEY BURGH.

William Dunn.

## ROSS AND CROMARTY.

John Galloway Weir.

## ROXBURGH.

Hon. Mark Francis Napier.

## HAWICK DISTRICT OF BURGHES.

Thomas Shaw.

## STIRLING.

William Jacks.

## FALKIRK DISTRICT OF BURGHES.

Harry Smith.

## STIRLING DISTRICT OF BURGHES.

Right Hon. Henry Campbell-Bannerman.

## SUTHERLAND.

Angus Sutherland.

## WIGTON.

Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell, bt.

## IRELAND.

## ANTRIM.

## NORTH ANTRIM DIVISION,

Charles Cunningham Connor.

## MID ANTRIM DIVISION,

Hon. Robert Torrens O'Neill.

## EAST ANTRIM DIVISION,

Captain James Martin M'Calmont.

## SOUTH ANTRIM DIVISION,

William Grey Ellison Macartney.

## BELFAST BOROUGH.

*North Belfast Division,*

Sir Edward James Harland, bt.

*East Belfast Division,*

Gustav Wilhelm Wolff.

*South Belfast Division,*

William Johnston.

*West Belfast Division,*

Hugh O. Arnold-Foster.

*List of*

{COMMONS, 1892}

*Members.*

**ARMAGH.**

NORTH ARMAGH DIVISION,  
Colonel Edward James Saunderson.

MID ARMAGH DIVISION,  
Dunbar Plunket Barton.

SOUTH ARMAGH DIVISION,  
E. McHugh.

**CARLOW.**

John Hammond.

**CAVAN.**

WEST CAVAN DIVISION,  
Edmund Francis Vesey Knox.

EAST CAVAN DIVISION,  
Samuel Young.

**CLARE.**

EAST CLARE DIVISION,  
William Hoey Kearney Redmond.

WEST CLARE DIVISION,  
J. Rochefort Maguire.

**CORK.**

NORTH CORK DIVISION,  
James Christopher Flynn.

NORTH-EAST CORK DIVISION,  
William O'Brien.

MID CORK DIVISION,  
Charles Kearns Deane Tanner, M.D.

EAST CORK DIVISION,  
Captain A. J. C. Donelan.

WEST CORK DIVISION,  
James Gilhooly.

SOUTH CORK DIVISION,  
Edward Barry.

SOUTH-EAST CORK DIVISION,  
John Morrogh.

**CORK CITY.**

William O'Brien,  
Maurice Healy.

**DONEGAL.**

NORTH DONEGAL DIVISION,  
John Mains.

WEST DONEGAL DIVISION,  
Timothy Daniel Sullivan.

EAST DONEGAL DIVISION,  
Arthur O'Connor.

SOUTH DONEGAL DIVISION,  
John Gordon Swift Mac Neill.

**DOWN.**

NORTH DOWN DIVISION,  
Colonel Thomas Waring.

EAST DOWN DIVISION,  
James Alexander Rentoul, LL.D.

WEST DOWN DIVISION,  
Right Hon. Lord Arthur W. Hill.

SOUTH DOWN DIVISION,  
Michael McCartan.

NEWRY BOROUGH.  
Patrick George Hamilton Carvill.

**DUBLIN.**

NORTH DUBLIN DIVISION,  
John Joseph Clancy, M.A.

SOUTH DUBLIN DIVISION,  
Hon. Horace C. Plunkett.

**DUBLIN CITY.**

*College Green Division,*  
Dr. Joseph E. Kenny.

*Harbour Division,*  
Timothy Charles Harrington.

*St. Stephen's Green Division,*  
William Kenny.

*St. Patrick's Division,*  
William Field.

**DUBLIN UNIVERSITY.**  
Rt. Hon. David Robert Plunket, LL.D.,  
Edward Carson.

**FERMANAGH.**

NORTH FERMANAGH DIVISION,  
Richard Martin Dane.

SOUTH FERMANAGH DIVISION,  
P. Magilligan.

*List of*

{COMMONS, 1892}

*Members.***GALWAY.**

CONNEMARA DIVISION,  
Patrick James Foley.

NORTH GALWAY DIVISION,  
Colonel John Philip Nolan.

EAST GALWAY DIVISION,  
John Roche.

SOUTH GALWAY DIVISION,  
David Sheehy.

GALWAY TOWN.  
John Pinkerton.

**KERRY.**

NORTH KERRY DIVISION,  
Thomas Sexton.

WEST KERRY DIVISION,  
Sir Thomas Henry Grattan Esmonde, bt.

SOUTH KERRY DIVISION,  
Denis Kilbride.

EAST KERRY DIVISION,  
Jeremiah Daniel Sheehan

**KILDARE.**

NORTH KILDARE DIVISION,  
Patrick James Kennedy.

SOUTH KILDARE DIVISION,  
Matthew J. Minch.

**KILKENNY.**

NORTH KILKENNY DIVISION,  
Patrick McDermott.

SOUTH KILKENNY DIVISION,  
Patrick Alexander Chance.

KILKENNY CITY.  
Thomas B. Curran.

**KING'S COUNTY.**

BIRR DIVISION,  
Bernard Charles Molloy.

TULLAMORE DIVISION,  
Dr. Joseph Francis Fox.

**LEITRIM.**

NORTH LEITRIM DIVISION,  
Patrick A. McHugh.

SOUTH LEITRIM DIVISION,  
Jasper Tully.

**LIMERICK.**

WEST LIMERICK DIVISION,  
M. Austin.

EAST LIMERICK DIVISION,  
John Finucane.

LIMERICK CITY.  
Francis Arthur O'Keeffe.

**LONDONDERRY.**

NORTH DERRY DIVISION,  
Henry Lyle Mulholland.

SOUTH DERRY DIVISION,  
Thomas Lea.

LONDONDERRY CITY.  
John Ross.

**LONGFORD.**

NORTH LONGFORD DIVISION,  
Justin McCarthy.

SOUTH LONGFORD DIVISION,  
Edward Blake.

**LOUTH.**

NORTH LOUTH DIVISION,  
Timothy Michael Healy.

SOUTH LOUTH DIVISION,  
Daniel Ambrose, M.D.

**MAYO.**

NORTH MAYO DIVISION,  
Daniel Crilly.

WEST MAYO DIVISION,  
John Deasy.

EAST MAYO DIVISION,  
John Dillon.

SOUTH MAYO DIVISION,  
James Francis Xavier O'Brien.

**MEATH.**

NORTH MEATH DIVISION,  
Michael Davitt.

SOUTH MEATH DIVISION  
Patrick Fullam

*List of*

{COMMONS, 1892}

*Members.*

**MONAGHAN.**

NORTH MONAGHAN DIVISION,  
Charles Diamond.

SOUTH MONAGHAN DIVISION,  
Florence O'Driscoll.

**QUEEN'S COUNTY.**

OSSORY DIVISION,  
Eugene Crean.

LEIX DIVISION,  
Mark Antony MacDonnell, M.D.

**ROSCOMMON.**

NORTH ROSCOMMON DIVISION,  
Matthias McDonnell Bodkin.

SOUTH ROSCOMMON DIVISION,  
Luke Patrick Hayden.

**SLIGO.**

NORTH SLIGO DIVISION,  
Bernard Colleary.

SOUTH SLIGO DIVISION,  
Thomas Curran.

**TIPPERARY.**

NORTH TIPPERARY DIVISION,  
Patrick Joseph O'Brien.

MID TIPPERARY DIVISION,  
John W. McCarthy.

SOUTH TIPPERARY DIVISION,  
Francis Mandeville.

EAST TIPPERARY DIVISION,  
Thomas Joseph Condon.

**TYRONE.**

NORTH TYRONE DIVISION,  
Lord Frederick Spencer Hamilton.

**TYRONE—cont.**

MID TYRONE DIVISION,  
Matthew Joseph Kenny.

EAST TYRONE DIVISION,  
William James Reynolds.

SOUTH TYRONE DIVISION,  
Thomas Wallace Russell.

**WATERFORD.**

WEST WATERFORD DIVISION,  
Alfred Webb.

EAST WATERFORD DIVISION,  
Patrick Joseph Power.

WATERFORD CITY.  
John Edward Redmond.

**WESTMEATH.**

NORTH WESTMEATH DIVISION,  
James Tuite.

SOUTH WESTMEATH DIVISION,  
Donal Sullivan.

**WEXFORD.**

NORTH WEXFORD DIVISION,  
Thomas J. Healy.

SOUTH WEXFORD DIVISION,  
John Barry.

**WICKLOW.**

WEST WICKLOW DIVISION,  
James O'Connor.

EAST WICKLOW DIVISION,  
John Sweetman.





THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

AUTHORISED EDITION

IN THE  
FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT OF  
THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND,  
APPOINTED TO MEET 4 AUGUST, 1892, IN THE FIFTY-SIXTH YEAR  
OF THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

---

FIRST VOLUME OF SECOND SESSION 1892.

---

THE TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT of the United Kingdom—which had met for the despatch of Business on Thursday, the 5th day of August, 1886—was prorogued and dissolved by Proclamation on Tuesday, the 28th day of June, 1892:—And Her Majesty thereon declaring Her pleasure to call a new Parliament, directed Writs to be issued accordingly; which Writs were made returnable on Thursday, the 4th day of August.

The PARLIAMENT was opened by Commission.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Thursday, 4th August, 1892.*

THE HOUSE of PEERS being met,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House,

“That Her Majesty, not thinking fit to be personally present here this day, has been pleased to cause a Commission to be issued under the Great Seal, in order to the opening and holding of this Parliament.”

VOL. VII. [FOURTH SERIES.]

Then Five of the LORDS COMMISSIONERS—namely, The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Halsbury); The CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER (The Duke of Rutland); The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Viscount Cross); The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Lord Knutsford); The LORD CHAMBERLAIN (The Earl of Lathom)—being in their Robes, and seated on a Form placed between the Throne and the Woolsack, commanded the Yeoman Usher of the Black Rod to let the COMMONS know “The Lords

B

Commissioners desire their immediate Attendance in this House, to hear the Commission read."

Who being come ;

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

"We are commanded by HER MAJESTY to let you know, it not being convenient for Her to be present here this day in Her Royal Person, that she has thought fit, in order to the opening and holding of this Parliament, to cause Letters Patent to be issued under the Great Seal, empowering His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and several other Lords therein named Her Commissioners, to do all things in Her Majesty's name, on Her part necessary to be performed in this Parliament, and this will more fully appear by the Letters Patent themselves, which will now be read.

Then the said Letters Patent were read by the Clerk. And then

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"We have it in command from Her Majesty to let you know that as soon as the Members of your House shall be sworn, Her Majesty will declare the causes of Her calling this Parliament ; and, it being necessary that a Speaker of the House of Commons shall be first chosen, it is Her Majesty's Pleasure that you, Gentlemen of the House of Commons, repair to the Place where you are to sit, and there proceed to the Choice of some proper Person to be your Speaker ; and that you present such Person whom you shall so choose here, to-morrow, at Twelve o'clock, for Her Majesty's Royal approbation."

Then the Commons withdrew.

#### PRAYERS.

The Lord Chancellor—Singly, in the first place, took the Oath at the Table.

ROLL OF THE LORDS—Garter King of Arms attending, *delivered* at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the First Session of the Twenty-fifth Parliament of the United Kingdom: The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Certificate of the Election of Sixteen Representative Peers for Scotland—*Delivered*, and read as follows :—

Earl of Mar.

- „ Morton.
- „ Mar and Kellie.
- „ Haddington.
- „ Lauderdale.
- „ Lindsay.
- „ Airlie.
- „ Carnwath.
- „ Leven and Melville.
- „ Dundonald.

Viscount Strathallan.

Lord Forbes.

- „ Saltoun.
- „ Sinclair.
- „ Balfour of Burleigh.
- „ Polwarth.

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

House adjourned at Four o'clock, till  
To-morrow, Twelve o'clock.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Thursday, 4th August, 1892.*

The House met at Two of the clock ; and, it being the first day of the meeting of this Parliament, pursuant to Proclamation, *Reginald Francis Douce Palgrave*, esquire, Clerk of the House of Commons, *Archibald John Scott Milman*, and *Francis Broxholme Grey*

*Jenkinson*, esquires, Clerks Assistant, attending in the House, and the other Clerks attending, according to their duty, *Kenneth Augustus Muir Mackenzie*, esquire, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in *Great Britain*, delivered to the said *Reginald Francis Douce Palgrave* a Book, containing a List of the Names of the Members returned to serve in this Parliament.

Several of the Members repaired to their Seats.

A Message was delivered by *Thomas Dacres Butler*, esquire, Yeoman Usher of the Black Rod :

"Gentlemen,

"The Lords, authorized by virtue of Her Majesty's Commission to open this Parliament, desire the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the House of Peers, to hear the Commission read."

Accordingly, the House went up to the House of Peers ;—And a Commission having been read for opening and holding the Parliament, the Lords Commissioners directed the House to proceed to the Election of a Speaker, and present him To-morrow, at Two of the clock, in the House of Peers for the Royal Approbation.

And the House being returned ;—

#### ELECTION OF A SPEAKER.

\*(2.20.) *SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY* (Lancashire, N., Blackpool) : Mr. Palgrave, in accordance with the gracious communication we have just received from Her Majesty, it becomes the first duty of the House of Commons, as it is our ancient and undoubted privilege, to proceed to the election of a Speaker. I hope I may be allowed to express my own personal feeling that no greater pleasure, no greater honour, could have been conferred on me than that I should be invited to propose for re-election to that high office my right hon. Friend the Mem-

ber for Warwick and Leamington. I do not doubt that the name of Mr. Peel will be accepted by the House with unanimous, nay, I may say with enthusiastic, approval. I am convinced that all Members of this House, old Members and new Members alike, will feel—the old ones from long experience of him, the new Members from that general public repute which my right hon. Friend has earned—that this House will be indeed fortunate if able again to secure the services of a Speaker so well tried and so successful. We have been accustomed to look to our Speakers to uphold the honour and dignity, and to maintain the privileges of this great Assembly, which is the guardian of the liberties of the people. We have looked to them to enforce with rigid and severe impartiality the rules of order and debate, so that there may be in this House perfect freedom of speech and due regard paid to the privileges of majorities and minorities alike. We have looked to them, perhaps above all, to erect a high standard of public honour, and to promote and carry on those unwritten laws of mutual courtesy and good feeling which ought assuredly to be the key-note of all our proceedings, and which are among the most revered and most valued traditions of this House. In the past we have never looked in vain for men of high and independent character, and of pre-eminent ability, to carry out these duties ; and at the present moment I am sure I shall carry with me the whole feeling of the House when I say that Mr. Peel, during his long service in that Chair to which he was elected by a happy choice some eight years ago, has maintained to the utmost the noble traditions of his distinguished predecessors, and I will venture to say has added additional lustre even to the honoured name he bears. The authority of the Chair is based upon, and is derived from, the confidence of the House. Without that confidence no Standing Orders, no powers, however conferred upon the occupant of the Chair, can be, or ever will be, of the slightest avail. If we have been accustomed to expect from our Speakers—as we have expected from them—great capacity, great

abilities, and power to perform the most important functions, we have at the same time on our side, we, the House of Commons, always given them our confidence—always have we reposed confidence in them. The occasions are frequent, and they occur most unexpectedly, when the Speaker is called upon, unaided and alone and at once, to decide upon difficult points which may have most supreme consequences—points which require not only accurate knowledge of the forms and precedents of the House, but which demand the greatest courage and firmness to apply those precedents to the exigencies of the moment. The voice of the Chair is the voice of the House, and it is of the supremest importance that every individual Member of this House should, from his inmost convictions, feel that confidence in the Chair without which, I will venture to say, there can be no security for order or adequate protection for liberty of debate. I am sure that I carry with me the conviction of the whole House when I say that in this respect also Mr. Peel has pre-eminently shown qualities which have, during his tenure of office, added to the due authority and efficiency of the Chair, and have in the most marked manner earned the approval and confidence of the House. I hope I may be permitted to add that there is no Member in any quarter of the House who has had occasion for the advice and assistance of Mr. Peel, as Speaker, who has not experienced at his hands the most kindly attention and the most unwearied courtesy. I am confident that I am right in saying there are in every quarter of the House the most strong feelings of personal regard and friendship for him. I feel, therefore, the most profound belief that when I am proposing the re-election of our tried and honoured Speaker of now three Parliaments there will be no discordant note whatever in the House; but, on the contrary, there will be an unanimous feeling that the House will be wise if it again puts faith in a man so well qualified to guide its deliberations and to maintain its dignity. The demands upon the physical strength of our Speaker are,

*Sir Matthew White Ridley*

as we all know, serious; and I rejoice—we all rejoice—that in the case of my right hon. Friend that strength, however at times it has been sorely tried, has proved itself adequate. I heartily trust that we may congratulate him, with truth, upon health unimpaired, and I express the hope, on behalf of the whole House, that he may be long spared to fulfil those honourable and arduous duties to which I now propose the House should again call him. I move—“That the right honourable Arthur Wellesley Peel do take the Chair of this House as Speaker.”

(2.30.) MR. W. E. GLADSTONE (Edinburgh, Midlothian): Mr. Palgrave, the hon. Baronet (Sir Matthew White Ridley) who has just sat down has expressed, in the course of his speech, a hope well warranted, I think, by the circumstances of the case, that on the occasion with which we have now to deal there will be no discordant note in the proceedings or in the discussions of this House. Sir, I rise to meet, so far as depends upon me, the expression of that hope; and I feel confident that with regard to all for whom, or in whose name I may even in the slightest degree be entitled, presumably, to speak, that I can echo back in their fulness the just encomiums which the hon. Baronet has pronounced upon the character, and the conduct, and the proceedings of the late Speaker of the House. Sir, the hon. Baronet himself has dealt with this subject in a manner as just as it was ample; and I have the satisfaction of thinking that while I am able to adopt, I think, every expression that fell from the lips of the hon. Baronet, he has left me little indeed to add. There is one word that perhaps I may say. I may anticipate, without the slightest doubt, in reliance upon what has already taken place, the unanimity of these proceedings, and I venture to anticipate the compliments which, had there been an uncertain issue before us,

it might have been wiser to reserve—the compliments and congratulations which I may offer to my right hon. Friend, with whom, in addition to my experience of him in the Chair, I have enjoyed the privilege of a long friendship, dating perhaps from the middle part of my life, and from an early period indeed in his. Within these recent years, and especially within the period of my Parliamentary life, great changes have taken place in regard to the Chair. At all times, I apprehend, the Speaker—although he may be regarded only as a single individual, yet as representing a position, and an influence, and a power so great—forms an integral and essential part of the existence of the House of Commons. The Speaker ceases in a manner to be an individual when he takes the Chair, and the House of Commons never can be well unless the Speaker is firmly lodged in the Chair, not only by the vote of the House, but by the unquestioning confidence of its Members. But, Sir, the change of which I speak is this—that although that great office has always been an office of very high elevation and demanding qualifications of no uncommon order, unquestionably one of the most marked among the changes that time has brought with it in respect to the Chair—so far as my own experience is concerned—has been the extraordinary increase in the demand made upon the Speaker of the House. I do not mean in formal additions to his duty—I do not mean in those additions which the increase of the volume of business naturally and necessarily brings with it; but I do not hesitate to say that great as was this office in the time of men like Mr. Manners Sutton—afterwards Lord Canterbury—it was an office comparatively small in regard to what it now is, and in regard to the calls that are made upon its occupant. Undoubtedly the activity of political life in the nation, its energy and vitality and the rapidity of its movements, are thoroughly reflected in the proceedings of this House. There is, I believe I may say, according to my experience and my conviction, not the smallest

tendency to a diminution in the minds of Members of the House of the respect and authority due to the Chair. I am fully convinced that whatever changes may take place, the practical good sense of the people of this country will continue to keep alive, and to keep high in the mind and conviction of every Member of the House, a sense of the necessity of the deference due to the Chair. But that deference may be paid with a greater or less degree of willingness according to the manner in which the power is exercised. And undoubtedly, Sir, I may offer to the gentleman whose name is now before the House this congratulatory expression—that as it appears to me, great as was the honour always conferred upon the Speaker of the House by his selection for so important a position, that honour has undergone an aggrandisement—a real and a true aggrandisement—in proportion to the increase in the difficulties as well as in the increase of the volume of the duties imposed upon him. Sir, we do not expect infallibility from our Speakers; that is beyond the claims we are entitled to ask; but we expect from them much—great acuteness, wide knowledge, great patience, and the disposition and capacity to acquire a thorough mastery of all questions, however difficult they may be, that may arise in the course of the proceedings of this House. We expect from them—in a degree unusual with respect to high offices of this kind—that readiness of mind which, as the hon. Baronet has well said, is essential to the Speaker on a multitude of occasions with regard to which you cannot tell when they will arise, but you know they must arise frequently, and the Speaker must act upon the moment, and act without assistance. Sir, all these things we have found in the mind and character of my right hon. Friend. But we have found beyond them all this—a sense of personal honour and a knowledge of the duty of absolute and, if possible, more than judicial impartiality, and these so deeply impressed upon the mind as to form a leading characteristic of the individual and of his character. The Speaker of the House must, as the hon. Baronet has well said, possess the

confidence of the entire House. This is a proposition which cannot be too often repeated and too deeply felt. If our debates from period to period come to be of more and more interest, and there be more and more difficulty in maintaining the line of absolute and unswerving rectitude, it is more and more important that that sense of honour and impartiality should be raised to the very highest point of which the human mind is capable. The Speaker of the House of Commons must stand not only beyond complaint, but beyond the faintest breath of suspicion. For that breath of suspicion falling upon his reputation it is too possible might not require to be embodied in a complaint, so subtle would be its agency and so fatally and surely it might underwork his influence. Sir, these are the demands which I have endeavoured to state without diminution or extenuation, and which I have so stated in the strongest terms, because I am able confidently to add that the whole of those demands have been satisfied in yourself, Mr. Peel. I believe I have deviated unconsciously in making by a single word a reference to my right hon. Friend. He will, however, understand how I was led into that error. But, addressing the House, I repeat that, in my opinion, it is impossible to deny that on all these points which I have named, and some of which undoubtedly involve questions of the utmost difficulty, and questions involving much more than an ordinary sense and an ordinary standard of honour and integrity—on all these points, essential points, on which the dignity and authority of the office depend, even more than upon the formal vote of the House of Commons, we have looked to the late Speaker for satisfaction, and we have obtained that satisfaction entire and unqualified. I, therefore, Sir, with most lively pleasure on my own part, and, I believe, on the part of all those who have had on this side of the House an opportunity of forming judgment for themselves, take upon me to second the Motion that has been made—"That the Right Honourable Arthur Wellesley Peel do take the Chair as Speaker of the House of Commons."

*Mr. W. E. Gladstone*

The House then unanimously calling Mr. PEEL to the Chair,

\*(2.41.) MR. A. W. PEEL (Warwick and Leamington): Mr. Palgrave, I am very keenly and deeply sensible of the honour and favour which have been conferred upon me by the hon. Baronet the Member for the Blackpool Division (Sir Matthew White Ridley), and by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), in respectively moving and seconding my nomination to the Chair of this House. I very deeply appreciate, moreover, the honour which the House appears to do me by ratifying the remarks that have been made. I cannot appropriate those expressions to myself, but I am none the less grateful to those gentlemen for having presented me in so favourable a light. I cannot also forget, Sir, that I am indebted to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) for having first presented me to this House in the year 1884. I cannot forget that twice during the year 1886 the right hon. Gentleman once made what is called the congratulatory speech to me after I had assumed the Chair, and on the second occasion, in August, 1886, seconded my nomination to that office. I do not propose to say much on the present occasion. I cannot bring before the new Members of this House—who constitute a large proportion of it—I cannot produce before them any qualifications for the Chair; and to the House at large I cannot say anything that is novel or interesting, the less so, perhaps, because this is the fourth occasion on which it has been my honour to be placed in the position which I now occupy. I hope the House will pardon me making what I confess is almost a strictly personal observation. If it be the pleasure of the House again to elect me to that Chair, it will be the fourth occasion on which I have been called upon to fulfil the duty.

For a Member of this House to be called four times to that Chair is an unusual circumstance. It is certainly not unprecedented, for Mr. Speaker Denison and Mr. Speaker Shaw Lefevre both were called four times to fill the Chair; and going back to an earlier period, one Member of this House, Mr. Speaker Onslow, was certainly elected five times to fill the duties of the Chair. I hope, as I said, the House will pardon this personal consideration. It is not, however, a question how often a Member of this House is called to that Chair; it is a question how he fulfils the duties when he is placed there. It may be a small thing to say, but I hope it may count for something, that if I am placed there it will be my endeavour to discharge, to the best of my abilities, the duties, the ever increasing duties — increasing in their onerousness and responsibility—which attach to the occupant of that Chair. If I fill the Chair again I shall be attached to the House by a lengthening chain of obligation for having elected me so often, but I shall look for any success that may be achieved, not to myself or to any personal efforts of my own; I shall look to the support of every man in this House. Without that support a Speaker can do nothing; with that support there is little that he cannot do. I shall ask then the support of every hon. Member, old and new, on whatever side of the House he sits, to whatever Party he may belong. That support I ask for in endeavouring to uphold the traditions which, in the course of centuries, have grown around the history of this House. That support I ask for in applying those rules which from time to time the House has been pleased to make for the enforcement of order, and for what is saying the same thing—the freedom of debate. Lastly, Sir, I shall look to the House at large for this purpose especially. The Speaker, without the support, as I have said, of the House can do nothing; but when he sits in that Chair with the support of hon. Members, he will be able to do something to sustain the character of the House—a character which I hope has lost nothing of its true meaning

and importance in the eyes of this country, the deep importance of which I hope has not been impaired. He will look to the House to support him in maintaining those high attributes which have attached to this House, and which have from year to year given to it a special value and a peculiar character, and which have raised it to so high—I may be pardoned here for saying, so commanding a position—amongst the great Legislative Assemblies of the world. And now, Sir, I thank the House very humbly and very respectfully for the honour they have done me in receiving the few remarks I have made in the way they have. I submit myself to the House, and I am conscious, indeed, of many imperfections which the kindness of the House has overlooked. I now place myself unreservedly in the hands of the House, and await its judgment.

The House then again unanimously calling Mr. PEEL to the Chair; he was taken out of his place by the said Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, and the said Mr. W. E. GLADSTONE, and conducted to the Chair.

And then the Mace, which before lay under the Table, was now laid upon the Table. Then—

(2.49). THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In accordance with the immemorial custom of this House, it now falls to me to offer you the congratulations of the House upon your election to the Chair. Under any circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that to have that honour conferred upon you must be a subject of congratulation. But that it should be conferred for the fourth time gives it a significance which only those acquainted with the course of our Debates can fully appreciate or understand. It is, perhaps, inevitable, human nature being what it is, that we look with somewhat different eyes upon the rights of the majority and the privileges of



the minority in this House, according as we sit upon your right hand or your left. But most of those who now hear me have been in this House under your Speakership, both as members of a minority and members of a majority; and, Sir, the unanimous decision which has just been come to is conclusive evidence—looked at from either point of view—that Members of the House, after a long experience, are of opinion that there is no man among their ranks so worthy to be entrusted with the responsibility they have just conferred upon you. If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, there is another ground of congratulation on this occasion. I think if there is any man who ought to be congratulated it is he who undertakes duties of very great difficulty and very great onerousness and very great responsibility, and who knows himself, and is known by all, to be equal to every call and every demand which those duties can possibly make upon him. The occupants of your Chair, Sir, have from time immemorial had very important duties to perform. They have had, in times now long gone by, to protect the interests of this House from external aggression. They now have duties cast upon them very different in kind, and, if I may venture to say so, far more weighty and important. We ask from our Speaker not merely a great knowledge of the traditions and precedents of this House, not merely kindness and courtesy, not merely an impartiality which is above suspicion, but we ask from him also tact and rapidity of decision under circumstances often of great difficulty; we ask from him great Parliamentary courage; and we ask from him, above all, those qualities which can only be described as the qualities of personality, without which the most profound knowledge of Parliamentary precedents would be absolutely useless and inoperative in the occupant of that Chair. Sir, you in some respects may be said to embody not only the traditions of the House, but the public conscience of the House, so far as the conduct of Debate is concerned; and on you, therefore, rests, more than on any other single Member of this House, responsibilities in connection with the traditions of this

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

House, and with the continuation of its reputation, which are indeed of the most serious character. If I consider the whole hierarchy of the responsible officials of this great community, none appears to me to have in his keeping interests of greater magnitude than, Sir, have been entrusted to you; and assuredly it is a matter of congratulation to every Member of this House, that every single one of us believes that in your keeping, Sir, those great interests are secure.

Then—

\*MR. SPEAKER-ELECT, standing on the upper step, said: Standing in this place, I have to make my acknowledgments to the House for having again elected me to the Chair. As I perfectly recognise the great responsibility I have undertaken, and with which you have entrusted me, I can only say that I place such abilities as I possess at your command, and as your servant, your officer, I hope to discharge those duties to your satisfaction, and in some measure justify the choice you have now made.

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
“That this House do now adjourn.”—  
(*Mr. A. J. Balfour*).

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at five minutes  
before Three o'clock.

---

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Friday, 5th August, 1892.*

---

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

The Lords Commissioners—namely, The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Halsbury); The CHANCELLOR of the DUCHY of LANCASTER (The Duke of Rutland); The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Viscount Cross); The SECRETARY

OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Lord Knutsford); The SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Lord Balfour of Burleigh)—being in their Robes, and seated on a Form placed between the Throne and the Woolsack, commanded the Yeoman Usher of the Black Rod to let the Commons know “The Lords Commissioners desire their immediate Attendance in this House.”

And the Commons being at the Bar;

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF  
COMMONS.

PRESENTED AND APPROVED.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE ARTHUR  
WELLESLEY PEEL, Speaker-Elect,  
said—

“MY LORDS,

“I have to acquaint your Lordships that, in obedience to Her Majesty’s commands, and in the exercise of their undoubted rights and privileges, Her Majesty’s faithful Commons have proceeded to the election of a Speaker, and that their choice has fallen upon myself. I now present myself at your Lordships’ Bar, and submit myself, in all humility, for Her Majesty’s gracious approbation.”

Then THE LORD CHANCELLOR  
said—

“MR. PEEL,

“We are commanded to assure you that Her Majesty is so fully sensible of your zeal in the public service, and of your ample sufficiency to exercise the arduous duties which Her Majesty’s faithful Commons have selected you to discharge, that she doth most readily approve and confirm you as their Speaker.”

Then MR. SPEAKER said—

“MY LORDS,

“I submit myself, with all humility, to Her Majesty’s gracious commands. It is now my duty, in the name and on behalf of the Commons of the United

VOL. VII. [FOURTH SERIES.]

Kingdom, in obedience to Her Majesty’s commands, to lay claim, by humble petition to Her Majesty, for the right of access to Her Majesty at all times, for the right of freedom of speech in Debate, and for the right of freedom from arrest of the persons of Her Majesty’s Commons. I lay claim to these privileges in accordance with the usual custom, and I beg that the most favourable construction should be put upon all the proceedings of the House of Commons. As for me, if any error should be committed, I pray that it may be imputed to me alone, and not to Her Majesty’s faithful Commons.”

Then THE LORD CHANCELLOR  
said—

“MR. SPEAKER,

“We have it further in command to inform you that Her Majesty doth most readily confirm all the rights and privileges which have ever been granted to or conferred upon the Commons by any of Her Majesty’s royal predecessors. With respect to yourself, Sir, although Her Majesty is sensible that you stand in no need of such assurance, Her Majesty will ever place the most favourable construction upon your words and actions.”

Then the Commons withdrew.

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

House adjourned at Four  
o’clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Friday, 5th August, 1892.*

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

The House being met, and Mr. SPEAKER-ELECT having taken the Chair,

C

a Message was delivered by the Yeoman Usher of the Black Rod :

“ MR. SPEAKER,

“ The Lords, authorised by virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, desire the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the House of Peers.”

Accordingly, Mr. SPEAKER-ELECT, with the House, went up to the House of Peers, when he was presented to the said Lords Commissioners for the Royal Approbation.

Then THE LORD CHANCELLOR, one of the said Lords Commissioners, signified Her Majesty's Approbation of Mr. Speaker-Elect.

The House being returned :—

MR. SPEAKER (standing in his usual place) : I have to acquaint the House that, in the House of Peers, Her Majesty, through Her Royal Commissioners, has been pleased to approve of the choice that you have made of me as your Speaker, and that I have, in your name and on your behalf, laid claim by humble Petition to Her Majesty to all your ancient Rights and Privileges—freedom of speech in debate, freedom from arrest of your persons and servants, and freedom of access at all times when opportunity offers to Her Majesty, and that the most favourable construction may be placed on all your proceedings. All these privileges, Her Majesty, through Her Commissioners, has approved and confirmed in as ample a manner as any of Her Royal Predecessors.

It is my duty once more to thank the House for the honour done to me in placing me here, and I have now to ask hon. Members to follow me in taking the Oath at the Table. It may be for the convenience of the House if I state what has already been stated in printed papers circulated among Mem-

bers, that Privy Councillors and those who have been in the Ministry should in the first place take the Oath at the Table. It has been thought convenient to follow a precedent in this, which seemed to meet with the approval of the House, that not more than five Members at a time should present themselves at the Table to take the Oath, and if hon. Members will kindly not present themselves when they see five Members at the Table, I think it will conduce to the regularity of our proceeding and the despatch of the duty of taking the Oath.

Mr. SPEAKER then took and subscribed the Oath first alone ; and after him several other Members took and subscribed the Oath ; and several other Members made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

House adjourned at a quarter  
after Four o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Saturday, 6th August, 1892.*

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath ; and one other Member made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

### ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House, at its rising this day, do adjourn till Monday next, at One of the clock.

House adjourned at half after Two  
o'clock till Monday next,  
at One of the clock.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Monday, 8th August, 1892.*

The House met at Two of the clock.

PRAYERS.

Then Five of the LORDS COMMISSIONERS—namely, The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Halsbury); The Duke of PORTLAND (Master of the Horse); The Earl of COVENTRY (Master of the Buckhounds); The UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE for WAR (Earl Brownlow); The SECRETARY OF STATE for the COLONIES (Lord Knutsford) — being in their Robes, and seated on a Form placed between the Throne and the Woolsack, commanded the Yeoman Usher of the Black Rod to let the COMMONS know “The Lords Commissioners desire their immediate Attendance in this House, to hear the Commission read.”

Who being at the Bar, with their Speaker:—The Commission was read by the Clerk:—Then

## THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR delivered HER MAJESTY'S SPEECH to both Houses of Parliament, as follows:—

*“My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

“We have to inform you by the command of Her Majesty that the present Parliament has been assembled in obedience to the terms of Her Majesty's Proclamation of the 28th June 1892, by which the late Parliament was dissolved.

“Previous to that Dissolution the business of the Session was completed; and it is therefore not necessary that Parliament should now continue in session at an unusual period of the year for the transaction of financial or legislative business.

“It is Her Majesty's hope that when you meet again at the customary season you will again direct your attention to measures of social and domestic improvement, and that you will continue to advance in the path of useful and beneficent legislation, which

has been so judiciously followed in previous Sessions.

Then the Commons withdrew.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

## REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR SCOTLAND.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had received (by post) from the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland, Minutes of the meeting held on the 14th of July last of the Peers of Scotland for the election of their representatives to sit and vote in the ensuing Parliament of the United Kingdom; and also, Return by the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland concerning Titles of Peerages called at the said meeting, in right of which respectively no vote had been received and counted for fifty years last past as at the date of the said meeting: Ordered that the said Minutes of Election, &c. be printed. [No. 1.]

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

## SAT FIRST.

The Duke of Somerset, after the death of his brother.

## SELECT VESTRIES.

Bill, pro forma, read 1<sup>a</sup>.

## THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

## ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

The QUEEN'S SPEECH reported by The LORD CHANCELLOR.

\*THE EARL OF DENBIGH (who wore the uniform of an officer of the Royal Artillery): My Lords, in rising to move that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to thank her for her Gracious Speech from the Throne, I hope I may remind your Lordships that the duty of moving and seconding this Address is, I believe, almost invariably entrusted to two of the more junior Members of your Lordships' House who cannot claim to have any, or at all events but little, experience in the matter of addressing this august assembly; and consequently, my Lords, your indulgence is always

asked for, and is always as readily conceded. But, my Lords, I feel that to-day I have perhaps a somewhat extra claim upon your generous consideration, because on ordinary occasions the Mover and Seconder of the Address to Her Majesty are able to apply their remarks to the future policy of the Government as foreshadowed in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech; but unfortunately on this occasion, as your Lordships will have perceived, I am afraid that course is open neither to me nor to the noble Earl who follows me. And perhaps I may ask your Lordships' permission to depart therefore from the usual precedent which has generally been followed, and, instead of applying myself entirely to prospective issues, to cast more retrospective glances at what has been done in the past history of the Government. My Lords, looking back at the last Session of Parliament I think that we who sit on this side of the House and support the Government of the noble Marquess may lay just claim to the fact that there has been a steady continuance of that policy of wise and beneficent legislation which has distinguished this Government during the last six years of its holding office. Perhaps, my Lords, one of the most important Acts which was passed during the last Session of Parliament—at all events, an Act which may be described as striking out an almost entirely new line of legislation—was that important Act for the purpose of facilitating the creation of small agricultural holdings. My Lords, we cannot claim for this Act, as can be claimed for many other important Parliamentary Acts, that there will at once be seen far-reaching and important changes throughout the country as a consequence of the Act. We may rather say that its results, which we hope will be effectual, cannot be other than very gradual; and it is quite possible that to mere casual observers its effects will not be very patent for some time to come; but still, at the same time, we regard it as an honest and conscientious experiment in the direction of endeavouring to solve a difficulty and of supplying a want which is very considerably felt by a large section of Her Majesty's subjects. I

*The Earl of Denbigh*

am afraid, my Lords, that the success of this measure may be said to be somewhat in danger, both from the action of its opponents and the action of its too zealous friends. I am afraid there are in the country, at least if we may judge from their speeches, some who would not perhaps be sorry to see it fail in order that they might be able to have a stone to fling at its authors. But there are its more zealous friends who persuade themselves that there will be an immediate considerable reduction, and a very palpable reduction, in the number of those who forsake the rural districts and crowd into our manufacturing centres. I am very much afraid that those zealous friends are doomed to a certain amount of disappointment. We hope that there will be a good many who will stay in the country and devote themselves to agricultural pursuits as a consequence of this Act of Parliament; but, still, I am afraid that the natural increase of the population of the country will so far outstrip any number of small holdings which could be artificially created by this or any other Act, that the number of those who are prevented from going into the towns will be as it were but a drop in the ocean. It has been complained, my Lords, that no principle of compulsion was embodied in this Act, and that question was very fully argued both in your Lordships' House and in another place; but I am certain that your Lordships will be strongly of opinion that it is wiser to walk before we attempt to run; and surely it is better to prove the success or even the failure of these artificially created small holdings before introducing any system of compulsion which, if it is not a sham, must inevitably do a great deal to unsettle the agricultural interest and to cause a considerable amount of insecurity of tenure in the minds of the occupiers of large farms at the present moment. My Lords, there are many other Acts of Parliament which I will not weary your Lordships by detailing at the present moment, as I have no doubt the noble Earl who follows me will apply himself to some of them; but apart from those, and apart from actual Acts of Parliament which have been dealt with by this House, I think, my Lords,

we can fairly also congratulate ourselves upon that great and wise policy, to which this Government devoted itself, having been continued of doing its utmost to popularise and to strengthen our Army, and to improve the condition of our soldiers; and also to add efficiently to the strength of our Navy. My Lords, I have seen a criticism on that policy of the Government which I must say I think a most unworthy one. I have seen it stated both on political platforms and in the columns of important journals that although the Government presided over by the noble Marquess can certainly say that they have not spent a penny in actual warfare since they came into office, yet they cannot deny that they have spent very large sums of money upon preparations for war in the time of peace. I said, my Lords, that I think that is an unworthy criticism — I will go further, and I say I think it is a most short-sighted and mischievous criticism. My Lords, which nation is it that would be most exposed to attack in modern days—the nation that is prepared for war, or the nation that is not? And which section of the population is it which would first feel the dire effects of such a calamity as the defeat of our Navy on the high seas? My Lords, you know very well it would not be the rich in this country, it would not be the capitalists, or the land-owners, or the employers of labour, nor would it be those who have got money in the Bank; but it would be the working classes of this country, who would most assuredly be the first to feel that rise in the price of provisions and that dearth of employment which could be the only result of such a calamity as I have mentioned. My Lords, in these days of great democratic power, when the wrath of the masses is perhaps more easily aroused than it is allayed, I would not envy the feelings of any Minister at whose door it could fairly be laid that he had contributed to the defeat of the Navy by starving that Navy and by practising a false economy in order to win some cheap popularity by the introduction of what are called “popular Budgets.” My Lords, perhaps your Lordships will consider that this is neither the proper time nor the proper place to make any

remarks about the political situation in another place; but yet I would submit to your Lordships that the prospect of future legislation which is mentioned in the third paragraph of Her Majesty's Speech is so intimately bound up with the present political situation that it is almost impossible to deal with the one and to ignore the other. I noticed the other day, my Lords, that a prominent Member of the Irish Party, speaking in Ireland, said—

“We have the whole strength and power of Great Britain pledged to our cause.”

And then he said—

“After six years' reflection the electorate of Great Britain has deliberately elected a majority to Parliament pledged to the demands of the Irish nation.”

My Lords, all I can say to that is that unless the hon. Gentleman places on geographical expressions a somewhat different interpretation from that in common use in our elementary schools, I think it is a somewhat novel way for Great Britain to show her determination to grant Home Rule by returning a majority of about fifteen against it. My Lords, there is certainly a majority of the United Kingdom returned against the policy of the present Government, and that majority is called a majority strongly in favour of Home Rule; but I think, my Lords, it is a matter of common observation how that majority has been obtained. I would submit to your Lordships that it has been obtained mainly through appealing to individual and particular classes of the electorate, and by giving those classes to understand that the particular legislation which they most desire, and which they believe will do them the most good, will forthwith be adopted and placed in the forefront of national politics. Well, my Lords, for this reason the future policy which is mentioned in Her Majesty's Speech will be watched with a considerable amount of interest, and we shall be able to judge for ourselves as to whether performance in office bears any resemblance to criticism in Opposition. I venture to say, my Lords, that there will be some considerable disappointments expressed in the various sections of the electorate. I should say that most certainly there will be very considerable disappointment in the minds

of those agricultural voters who have contributed so largely to the return of that gallant forty, unless they see a very speedy approach of that millennium of excellent cottages and high wages, coupled with unlimited quantities of the best land held at the minimum of rent, which is to be established by the installation of practically omnipotent parish councils. My Lords, I am not here to-day to attempt to speak against the question of what is called Home Rule for Ireland; but still I would, with your Lordships' permission, before I sit down, like just to refer to one aspect of that question. Attempts have been made, as your Lordships well know, up and down the country to try and prove to the people that the noble Marquess levelled insults at, and maligned wilfully, the Roman Catholic body of the United Kingdom. I am certain that your Lordships would consider it gross presumption on my part to attempt, in the presence of the noble Marquess, any sort of explanation of his words; but still I should like to say that I can only regard the interpretation which has been placed upon those words as very little short of a most gross calumny. I think, my Lords, that if a certain section of the Irish clergy, by certain acts and by a certain abuse of their position, have brought down upon themselves some rather sharp criticism from this side of the House they have only got themselves to blame. Then, my Lords, we have been told that one of the principal arguments against Home Rule is the fear of religious persecution. I was glad to see that the noble Duke, who sits above the Gangway opposite, (the Duke of Argyll), in one of his vigorous and eloquent addresses some two or three months ago, stated that in his opinion the talk of religious persecution was all humbug. My Lords, I venture to agree with him. I think that religious persecution in the sense in which that term was known many years ago is now-a-days impossible. It is not religious persecution that we fear; it is intolerance, not necessarily religious, but certainly political. We do not fear intolerance against a man necessarily because he is a Catholic or a Protestant,

*The Earl of Denbigh*

but from what we have seen in years gone by from the action of the Nationalist Party in Ireland we do fear very great intolerance against those who wish to be honest and to pay their way, and who are likely to oppose what is known as the Nationalist policy. My Lords, I am certain that everybody in your Lordships' House, and I believe nearly everybody in the country, is now willing to admit that the Catholics of Ireland in days gone by were subject to a most unjust and most cruel persecution; and, my Lords, we must remember that the memory of that persecution remains in the minds of the Irish people, and I think it is only just to make a certain amount of allowance in that regard. But still, at the same time, we must remember that we live in the nineteenth century, and not in the eighteenth or the seventeenth. We have got to look at things as they are, and are likely to be in the immediate future; we have not so much to take into consideration what they were or were not some 150 years ago; and I do most distinctly feel that, even after making all allowances that can possibly be made, it is impossible to deny that the polling-booth and the vanguard of an election mob are not the places where the clergy of any denomination can add to their self-respect, or to that esteem and power for good which by the nature of their calling should be theirs. In conclusion, my Lords, I would with all respect venture to bring before you an opinion which I can only claim as my own humble one. I certainly do feel that there is a very large section of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland who still have a great right to claim additional advantages and additional freedom in the matter of higher education, and in the matter of removing vexatious and irritating restrictions in the conduct of the management of the elementary schools. But, my Lords, I do not by any means despair of these matters being dealt with and of these boons being conceded through the generosity and the broad-minded liberality of the Parliament at Westminster; and, looking to the fact how Ireland has been torn and sundered by political and religious jealousies in days gone by, and how at the present moment there are all the

elements for a renewal of those jealousies, I do strongly feel that in the interest of religious peace, and liberty in Ireland it would be far better for those matters to be dealt with by an independent Parliament at Westminster than by any Parliament that could be instituted at Dublin. My Lords, I have now, in conclusion, to thank your Lordships for your most kind indulgence and your kind reception of me to-day. I could not help remembering the other day a speech that was made by a noble Earl who sits on the Front Bench opposite, the late Secretary for Foreign Affairs, when he stated that it required, I think he said, a considerable amount of courage to address your Lordships' House. If my memory serves me aright, he said that your Lordships rarely applaud and never smile. Perhaps, my Lords, I may therefore be excused for having approached my task to-day with a certain amount of trepidation, and I can only thank your Lordships for having made that task so much easier than I had dared to anticipate. My Lords, I beg to move the Motion which stands in my name.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for Her Most Gracious Speech from the Throne, as follows:—

'MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.'"  
—(*The Earl of Denbigh*).

\*THE EARL OF POWIS (who wore the uniform of a Deputy Lieutenant): My Lords, in rising to second the Motion which has been so ably proposed by my noble Friend, I would say that it is a curious circumstance that in the year 1859, which is 33 years ago, my predecessor moved in this House the Address in reply to the Queen's Speech under circumstances almost identical with the present. My Lords, I would ask you, therefore, to accord to me that attention which you always so kindly extended to him on the few and rare occasions on which he spoke; and I would ask that it should be tempered with indulgence,

inasmuch as I am unable to bring to bear any of that scholastic knowledge with which he was able to amuse and interest your Lordships' House. With reference to the Gracious Speech from the Throne, I am sure that it is a source of the greatest satisfaction, not only to your Lordships' House but also to all the people of this country, to ascertain that the Parliamentary business has been so successfully completed that it will not now be necessary to detain Parliament at this unusual season of the year, and that Members of both Houses will be able to take that rest and recreation which is so necessary, not only for their health, but also for the further prosecution of their duties. My Lords, with reference to some of the beneficent legislation which has been referred to in the third paragraph of Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, I would ask you to pardon me if I give precedence to some of those measures which more closely interest the Principality in which it is both my pleasure and my privilege to dwell. By the passing of a measure, which has amply justified the hopes of its creators, the disgraceful scenes which at one time characterised the collection of tithes have been done away with, and I hope the question has now been laid to rest by the Tithe Act of 1891 once and for ever, to the satisfaction of all interested parties. I have further to congratulate Her Majesty's Government, if they will not think it presumptuous of me in doing so, upon the success which has already attended the measures which they have introduced bearing upon technical and elementary education. It is, indeed, a source of great satisfaction to the dwellers in the rural districts to observe the efforts which have been made by Her Majesty's Government to assist them in obtaining a better knowledge of those handicrafts by which they obtain their livelihood; and also to the poorer classes to find that they are now able to save the money which was formerly paid for the education of their children, either for the better clothing of their children or for their better food—or still more, for laying by a sum to start their children, when they leave school, in some trade or business. And, my Lords, this measure should largely



encourage thrift, inasmuch as the Post Office Savings Bank has come to its assistance. And now that I have mentioned the Postal Department, I would ask your Lordships to pardon me for an instant if I congratulate Her Majesty's Government upon having seen their way to introducing a universal and reduced rate of imperial and national postage. That subject brings me to the question of Imperial Defence; but I will not detain your Lordships long upon this subject, for the noble Lord who has just sat down has already mentioned it. I think it is a source of great satisfaction to us to know that the coaling stations and harbours of all Her Majesty's dominions have been strengthened, and also to remember that an Australian squadron has been established in southern waters with the assistance of the Colonies. I am sure that the noble Lord who rules over the destinies of our Navy in another House will allow me to congratulate him upon the efficiency of the Navy and the almost superhuman change which has been worked, not only in the number of the ships, but in their readiness to meet a foreign enemy. And as regards our Army, I am sure nothing can be more satisfactory to your Lordships than to know that every effort is being made to insure healthy quarters for the men, for, deeply as we deplore the loss of gallant soldiers in the field, it is far more terrible to hear that one of Britain's sons has perished from some malignant fever, from the fact that in time of peace an ungrateful country would not provide him with accommodation such as a man would think suitable for his dog. And I would not wish to convey the impression to your Lordships that I consider that England has been obtaining the entire advantage of the beneficent legislation which has been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne; but, my Lords, Ireland also has had a large measure of beneficent legislation, and I would ask your Lordships, therefore, to pardon me if for a few moments I dwell upon the Irish question. My Lords, we are told that a majority of the British people have demanded Home Rule. I would ask you to consider for a few moments who are the majority that have demanded

Home Rule. My Lords, is it in Great Britain, as the noble Lord who has just sat down asked, that we find a majority in favour of Home Rule? No, my Lords. If we look at the Sister Island, is it in the North of Ireland, amongst the educated portion of the population,—amongst the law-abiding inhabitants of the North—is it there that we find the demand for Home Rule? No, my Lords, most emphatically no. We have to look to the South of Ireland before we can find a majority in favour of that measure; amongst the population where till recently murder and outrage walked hand in hand, and where the law was of no avail; in a district where the population were accustomed to wreak their petty spite against their neighbours by torturing dumb beasts in a manner that would have disgraced a barbarous nation. Of such, my Lords, is the majority composed who are in favour of Home Rule, and who are dictating to Great Britain as to a revision of the Constitution. The majority is composed of those who have already declared their hatred, not only of England, but also of their brethren in the North. And what hope, I would ask your Lordships, would Ulster have of justice, let alone of safety, if a hostile majority of this description sat upon College Green? My Lords, you have heard much of Ulster's appeal to England. Ulster has appealed to England, because she knew it was useless to appeal to Ireland; but I am sure that the British people have not sunk so low that they will hand over the just to the unjust. I say the just unto the unjust, because it is well known that only a few years ago justice was impossible in the three Southern Provinces of Ireland. My Lords, we are told that the Union is intolerable to Ireland, that it stinks in her nostrils. I would ask you to review the condition of Ireland, only for a few seconds, previous and subsequent to the Union. We are told now that Ulster is the garden of Ireland. Well, my Lords, you well know that a garden can be formed almost anywhere if there is a judicious mixture put into the soil. That has been the case in Ulster. Previous to the Union, Ulster was the most barren and the most desolate of all the Provinces of Ireland; the inhabitants were the most

squalid and the most wretched of any in that country. But, by a judicious administration of the Union, upon those barren hill-sides a garden has arisen in Ireland. My Lords, I ask you whether you would destroy that garden and render it a waste once more? My Lords, we are told that Ulster demands ascendancy. That ascendancy, I conclude, is a religious ascendancy. Ulster has no such ascendancy, and it claims no such ascendancy. Its people live under the same laws under which your Lordships live. Your Lordships—at any rate Irish Lords—have no such ascendancy. My Lords, the lawless inhabitants of Ireland demand that you will change your Constitution—that you will give them a Parliament to sit upon College Green. These are not small demands. But, my Lords, what does Ulster demand? We have heard much of the demands of Ulster; but I fail to remember any demand on the part of Ulster. My Lords, I think you will remember that Ulster asks you for nothing. The only thing that Ulster asks you for is that you will leave her as she is at present, with the same protection which is given to every subject of Her Majesty's dominions. And now, with your Lordships' permission, I will, for a few moments, review the change which has taken place in the last six years in Ireland during the Government of the right hon. Gentleman who, if he will pardon my presumption in saying so, now so ably leads the other House. When the late Chief Secretary first went to Ireland we were told that his rule was "base, brutal, and bloody"; but whether it were base, or whether it were brutal, I think your Lordships cannot fail to see that a marvellous change has taken place in the condition of Ireland; crime has diminished, outrage has diminished, boycotting has disappeared, and the law has been re-established; and, if your Lordships require any proof of that, all that it is necessary to do is to point to two Charges given to the Grand Jury by Mr. Justice O'Brien, in one of which he says on the 10th of March, 1887—

"These Returns present a picture of County Kerry, such as could hardly be found in any country that has passed the confines of natural society."

And he proceeds—

"The law is defeated; perhaps I should say it has ceased to exist."

And then he concludes—

"A state of terror and lawlessness prevails everywhere."

But in 1892 the same Judge, addressing the Grand Jury at Cork Assizes, said—

"He was very much pleased, indeed, to be able to state that the county was in a most satisfactory condition. The offences reported for the corresponding period last year were 94, while for the present period they amounted to only 31. All trace of any kinds of offences indicating a state of disorder or agrarian disturbance was entirely wanting; boycotting was at an end; and the attention of the people generally was found to be turned to questions that affected their material prosperity."

All this has taken place, my Lords; and the stringent measures which were necessary previously have been abolished. My Lords, I would say that the reign of the Unionist Government has been bloodless in Ireland, for crime has almost ceased, and not only that, but a dangerous famine, which at one time threatened the inhabitants of Ireland, has been averted by the quick intervention of the Chief Secretary and the Lord Lieutenant. In those districts where there was danger of famine the people were provided with food and with employment; and the very means which were taken for the averting of the disaster have proved a source of permanent prosperity to the country. Your Lordships will, no doubt, know that I am referring to the Congested Districts and the Light Railways Acts. And now, if your Lordships desire any further proofs before I sit down of the prosperity which has come to Ireland during the last six years, I would ask you to remember that the prices of produce have risen; that Railway receipts have increased 14 per cent.; that deposits in Joint Stock Banks have increased 18 per cent., and in savings banks 53 per cent.; and, side by side with this, pauperism has decreased 13 per cent., emigration 18 per cent., indictable offences 28 per cent., and evictions 79 per cent. Well, my Lords, I will not detain you longer; but I think it has been abundantly proved that not only is the government of Ireland by England possible, but that it is absolutely necessary to its happiness. I think

it is proved that the rule of the Union is beneficial to Ireland, and that all that is necessary for that country is a firm administration of the law. My Lords, I thank you for your courtesy in having listened to me so long, and for your indulgence; and I have very great pleasure in seconding the Motion which has been already so ably moved by the noble Earl.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, I am not at all surprised that the noble Earl who moved the Address felt some difficulty as to what he should say upon such an occasion as this; but I am bound to say that both the noble Earls who moved the Address and seconded it have managed to give us two very interesting speeches, and found a variety of topics with which they could entertain the House. My Lords, for my part I felt very great doubt whether I ought to say anything to your Lordships on the occasion of the consideration of this Gracious Speech of Her Majesty. I am, however, very conservative in my instincts, and I wish, therefore, to adhere to the ordinary practice. And perhaps I am rather more conservative in this respect and on this occasion than Her Majesty's Government have been, because I think I am right in saying that this is the first occasion when a Speech of this kind has been delivered, on the advice of Her Ministers, by the Queen to a Parliament after a Dissolution. On the occasion which is historical, when Lord Melbourne advised the Dissolution of Parliament in 1841, and the result was a very large majority against his Government, the Government of the day in meeting Parliament made a full statement of their policy in the Speech which they advised Her Majesty to deliver from the Throne; and I do not think that any example can be found where a Speech of this colourless description has been delivered. However, my Lords, I do not complain of that; I merely make the remark in order that I may excuse myself for making very few observations indeed to the House on this occasion. I apprehend we are here to consider the Speech which has been delivered to us by the Queen's command, and when we find in such a Speech, as we ordinarily do, a statement of the policy of Her Majesty's advisers, it is natural

that we should take the opportunity in some sense to criticise that policy, and express our views with regard to the measures which may be promised in the Speech. But here we have nothing of the kind. The words are certainly most unobjectionable; but I wish to comment upon the words themselves in order to show that it is impossible, upon this side of the House at all events, that we could have the smallest objection to the expressions used. The hope is expressed that Parliament will again direct its attention to measures of social and domestic improvement, and that it will continue to advance in the path of useful and beneficent legislation, which has been so judiciously followed in previous Sessions. I have not a word to say against that. In previous Sessions it has happened that those who sit on this side of the House have been responsible for measures, and we are quite entitled to consider that the path of useful and beneficent legislation which has been followed in previous Sessions may apply to Sessions when Her Majesty was advised by Gentlemen who sit now on the Opposition side of the House as well as by those on that side. Therefore, there is nothing in the words of the Speech upon which any criticism can be grafted. The noble Lords, the Mover and Seconder of the Address, have most naturally applied the sentence to the legislation advised by the Government now in office. For my part, I am quite willing to say that some of that legislation was such that we had very great satisfaction in giving our support to the measures which were proposed; and I hope that it will be felt that in those measures which were not of a contentious kind—such a one as that to which the noble Earl opposite alluded, the measure for the creation of Small Holdings—we did not show the smallest disposition to throw any kind of obstacle in the way of the Government. On the contrary, we were very glad to give them all the assistance in our power, and to make suggestions which we think might have improved and carried further the legislation proposed. I can only say that if in the chances of political life before very long it should happen that we who sit on this side of the House should become responsible for

the proposal of measures to Parliament, I hope in such measures for social improvement as we may suggest we shall meet with the same spirit, and shall find noble Lords on the other side of the House as willing to co-operate with us in such measures as we have been to co-operate with them during the last Parliament. My Lords, with regard to all that interesting review of the measures of the Government, as to which we were not in agreement, and as to the present state of England and Ireland, and a variety of other topics, our opinions upon the measures have been expressed on every occasion when they were brought before us, and I am certain that no one in this House is ignorant of our opinions upon the general policy pursued by the late Government; and I should regard it as entirely out of place on an occasion of this kind, when no Amendment has been moved to the Address, and when there is no question before the House of a contentious kind, to enter into any discussion of that policy. My Lords, the Government now in power have thought proper to present us with a Speech to which I make no objection, in terms which raise no questions of policy of a contentious kind; and, for my part, I believe that the wisest and most proper course I can pursue under the circumstances is to say no more on the subject than that I fully concur in the Address that has been moved.

\*EARL COWPER: My Lords, the noble Lord who has just sat down, generally so eloquent and able, and capable of making a long and powerful speech, has only said a few words. I think he never showed his ability more than by doing so. I can quite understand that he should wish not to have a division in this House, because I think that would show rather the small extent of his following. I can also understand that he is not very anxious that this House should come very prominently before the public; because, among other things, it is possible that he and his Party may before very long come into serious conflict with this House, and it would, perhaps, be better that the less this House is thought of in the meantime, and the less the real ability which is contained within its walls is displayed, the better it may be. My Lords, I can

also understand that the noble Marquess, who, if I had not ventured to intervene, would probably have followed, will not think it necessary to say much. If he had been seriously attacked, or was actuated by motives of vanity and self-love, or if he thought it was an occasion to make a great and elaborate defence of his policy during the last six years, I venture to say that no Minister ever stood in a position so able to make a brilliant and eloquent vindication. Peace preserved abroad, under what people are beginning to find out have not after all been very easy and exceptionally favourable circumstances, and which I am afraid when his strong hand is removed from the helm will be found to be even less favourable and less easy than we have hitherto imagined them to be; financial policy, which has relieved the burdens of the people in a marked degree, and, at the same time, has added to the strength of our defences, particularly our Navy; Ireland, which when he came to the Government was in a state of outrage and intimidation on the one hand, and fear and discomfort on the other, now perfectly calm and quiet, not a single district being proclaimed; besides all this, numerous truly liberal and useful measures for the benefit of the people, conceived in the most statesmanlike spirit, Local Government, Free Education, the Allotments Bill, and the Small Holdings Act, and numerous other small ones, very good and very useful, which I need not go into; all these might make the foundation, as I say, if there had been any attack, of a most brilliant vindication. But, my Lords, there has not been any attack, and I think, unless somebody intervened, in a very few minutes our Debate would have come to an end. Now, my Lords, considering the exceptional circumstances in which we find ourselves, I cannot, for one, think that that would have been advisable or creditable to this House. I only venture to rise, not of course because I think that anything I myself may say would be such as to demand any very great attention from your Lordships, but because I feel that under these circumstances the only person who could rise must be a man independent, who did not himself hold office at this moment and is not

aspiring to do so; perhaps it should be one who is not an immediate supporter of those who are holding office at this moment, or of the other side. I do so because I think that one thing that the present Government and all who support them are most anxious, and most justly anxious, for, is that they should not for one moment be supposed to have any desire to cling to office after there has been a majority declared against them in the country, however small, compared with what it has been at the beginning of last Parliament, which we lately remember, and however mixed the character of that majority may be. My Lords, I hope I may be followed by others who will perhaps speak with greater weight than myself; there are plenty of people of ability and willingness to address your Lordships; but there is, unfortunately, a sort of nightmare feeling which oppresses every individual who ventures to rise, which, I believe, is totally unfounded, but which nevertheless exists—I do not know why—but which I very often suffer from myself, that this House, from the moment of its assembling, is anxiously and impatiently looking forward to the time when it may break up, and is very impatient of anybody who stands, even for a few minutes, in the way of its doing so. But I hope that that will not deter people on this occasion. Now, my Lords, in what circumstances are we placed? They are certainly most unusual, and, as I shall venture to show by-and-bye, altogether unprecedented. We are likely, as we all know, very shortly to have a change of Government, and the result of that will be the introduction of measures which deeply affect us all in this House, on which we, most of us, either here or elsewhere have expressed a most decided opinion. We all of us hold a great stake in the country which is likely to be affected by these measures—I do not only mean Ireland, but Great Britain also. Our natural vent for the expression of our opinions, when we feel strongly, is within these walls; it is because we have that vent for the expression of our opinions—it is this fact which is the excuse, and the only excuse, for our not being allowed to take any part in General Elections in

this country. I say, therefore, we ought to make use, and are justified in making use, of the natural vent which is afforded to us of expressing our opinions, and if we shrink from doing so we shall injure our position in the country. Now, my Lords, as I say, there is very likely to be a change of Government. It is not, of course, for us here to do more than to glance lightly at the circumstances which have occasioned that; as I say, I do no more than glance at the strange state of that majority which will shortly enable other people to assume the reins, resting as it practically does entirely upon the Irish Nationalists, who have declared over and over again that they intend to hold themselves aloof as a separate Party, and to watch their opportunity and only give a limited support to any Party in this country, whichever it may be, as long as it suits their own purposes. Nor will I do more than glance at the incidents of the last Election. We, as your Lordships know, and as was eloquently pointed out to us by Mr. Gladstone some years ago, are living in a balloon; we are not supposed to have any cognisance of those struggles and contests, although accompanied very often with great excitement, that have been going on below us during the last few weeks. I myself have sometimes felt inclined to have a glance over the car of the balloon to see what was going on; and I think probably some of your Lordships have done the same; and you could not help seeing, particularly in the rural districts, by what means that majority was too often got together—those disgraceful false promises about a cheap loaf, when those who made them must have known they could never be fulfilled. How could we have a cheaper loaf than at present except by subsidising the bakers? Can anybody imagine that to be possible? Then, as Lord Denbigh has pointed out, the promises about having land for next to nothing—what can they mean but either confiscation from those from whom the land is to be compulsorily bought, or the difference of rent being paid by the ratepayers?—neither of which I think any Government would venture to propose. I only allude to this to show that the majority is not formed in such a way or of such materials

*Earl Cowper*

as to command very great consideration on our part ; though, of course, we are bound to admit it as it stands. Now I have said that the circumstances in which we find ourselves are, or will be, altogether unprecedented. I will tell you why. This mixed mass of people holding different opinions, of different nationalities and of different feelings, is to be got together to propose a vote of want of confidence in the present Government. Well, it will probably carry that vote, and the present Government will retire. What then happens? Another Government will take the reins. Will it have any opportunity of seeing whether it has the confidence of the House of Commons? It does not always follow that because a vote against Lord Salisbury has been passed there is also a feeling of confidence in Mr. Gladstone. Will they have any opportunity of showing whether they can carry one single measure through the House of Commons, to say nothing of this House, which of course they consider out of the question? I say there would be no chance of this—when they have formed a Government Parliament will disappear, and they will be left for six months in absolute unrestrained possession of the field, without anybody knowing the least in the world whether they command the confidence of the House or not; they may bring us into every kind of difficulty abroad and at home, and when they come back in January or February, or whenever it may be, they may perhaps find after all that Parliament is not inclined to support them, and not inclined to carry them through. On no previous occasion, I believe, has such a state of things happened. On no previous occasion has Parliament separated without some interval, long or short, in which the new Government could show the public that it had the confidence of the other House and command over it. This is why I consider our circumstances thoroughly unprecedented. Now, my Lords, with regard to some of the evils that may happen during the approaching winter, I may perhaps allude shortly to them. I will not allude to the question of Foreign Affairs, though things grave enough may happen with regard to them ; but,

there are many in this House more conversant with that subject than I am. I will take the case of Ireland. If any people ever were pledged, to the very eyes, irrevocably pledged against anything like Coercion, it is the Members of the Government which will be likely to succeed the present one. I think that they have shown great adroitness and great facility in explaining pledges away and in changing their views ; but I do not think they could have recourse to Coercion under any circumstances. Therefore, we may assume that, whatever happens in that country during the winter, no use will be made of the Coercion Act, so-called, and that no single district will be proclaimed. But will those districts be quiet? We hope so. Have we reason to hope so with any confidence? Already I see that Mr. Gladstone has been assailed with demands on behalf of the evicted tenants, that they should be put back. Of course this does not mean put back after paying their rent ; it means put back without paying their rent ; because there are very few of them who, if they had been willing to pay their rent, would not have been put back long ago. I believe there has been a very wide feeling amongst the tenants in Ireland, encouraged very often by those who ought not to have done so, that when Mr. Gladstone comes in there will be either no rent at all or very little, and they need not trouble themselves about it. I say if these men act upon this idea, if there is a general strike against rent—which I think not improbable—and outrage following when there is an attempt to collect that rent, what will happen? I say anything in the shape of Coercion will be out of the question. The ordinary law has been proved in a state of great national excitement to be altogether useless. Will they trust to the National League to keep the peace for them? I believe there was a time, when the National League was united and strong under the iron hand of Mr. Parnell, that the League could do something in that way ; but look at it now! It is broken to pieces ; it is in two parties, to begin with ; and the bigger party is virtually without a leader. I do not think even the miserable expedient of keeping order through the National League can be successful ;

supporters of Mr. Gladstone himself. At this present moment, I suppose, a distinguished Member of the other House of Parliament (Mr. Asquith) is moving a Vote of Want of Confidence in the Government. My Lords, Mr. Asquith made a speech, in 1886 I think it was, in which he said—I should like to use his own words—

“The Leaders of the Liberal Party would be acting wisely if they were to take the country a little more into their confidence. There ought to be a broad general outline on which the opinion of the country should be taken. If they went to the country with the vague formula of Home Rule or Local Self-Government and obtained a majority and introduced a Bill, some of their own followers would say: ‘Our electorate sent us to support Home Rule; but this is not the kind of thing they intended.’”

That is the opinion of a very distinguished lawyer, one of the keenest supporters of Mr. Gladstone; and I suppose may be taken to represent to a great extent the cultivated intelligence of the Gladstonian Party. My Lords, there is another branch of the Gladstonian Party—namely, the Labour branch. I suppose we may say that Mr. Davitt, who has been returned to Parliament, is one of the most distinguished Members of the Labour Party in the country, and is also not unconnected with Ireland. What were his views upon the subject? He wrote an article in one of the Reviews immediately after one of the Midlothian campaigns, in which he expressed the greatest dissatisfaction at the reticence in regard to the Home Rule measure of Mr. Gladstone, and he said—

“The Bill of 1886 was anti-democratic and a retrograde measure. It was a fair question for the British working men to ask Mr. Gladstone before they gave him the power of framing the next Home Rule Constitution for Ireland, what he intended to do as respects the land in that country.”

There we have a representative of the Gladstonian Party in England, and a representative of the Labour Party. Now as regards the Irish Nationalists, I presume nobody can deny that they are not aware what the Home Rule proposed by Mr. Gladstone is—at any rate not publicly. Perhaps the most able and most liberal-minded and moderate member of the Nationalist Party of Ireland is Sir Gavan Duffy, who, as

*The Earl of Northbrook*

your Lordships know very well, was one of the Leaders in 1848 of the Revolutionary Party, who has since had a distinguished career in the Colonies, and has now come back and is taking an active interest in the furtherance of the Nationalist Party at the present time. He again complained in the strongest terms of the reticence of Mr. Gladstone in respect to the Home Rule measure. He called his complaint “The humble remonstrance of an Irish Nationalist,” and he said

“that the original plan of 1886 had been cast to the winds five years ago. It was a great mistake that Mr. Gladstone did not publish his revised scheme of Home Rule.”

He said

“that the principles and details cannot be made too plain for the encouragement of its friends and the confusion of its opponents. Nobody would think of omitting this kind of precaution in framing an agreement for the expenditure of £100. Is there any sufficient reason for omitting them in an agreement involving, not a handful of coin, but the peace and prosperity of two neighbouring nations?”

Then Sir Gavan Duffy proceeded to give seven different heads of questions to which he would like to have an answer. Not one of those questions has been answered up to the present time. He is representing the Nationalist Party; and I may sum up what I am about to say on this subject with what he ends with. We have had the representative of the English or Scotch Gladstonian Party; we have had the representative of the Labour Party; we have had the representative of the Nationalist Party; and he ends with these words—

“The House of Lords would be justified in refusing to adopt a constitutional change which has not received the sanction of the people, unless full explanations of this kind have been given.”

Now, my Lords, are we never in this House to be taken into the confidence of the Leaders of the Opposition? After five or six years have they not now made up their minds upon what Home Rule is to be, and are they not able to explain it to us at the present time? My Lords, I am not going to argue the question of Home Rule now; but I think it is as well to recollect what kind of questions

those are to which we have had no answers.

"Is the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament to consist merely in the power of repealing a law which creates Home Rule in Ireland; or is that supremacy to confer some power to the Imperial Parliament to remedy what the Imperial Parliament may consider to be an injustice, either legislative or executive, in Ireland?"

We have had no answer to that question. That question is by no means a question of detail; it is a question of principle.

"Is Home Rule to be confined to Ireland, or is it to be extended to the other side of St. George's Channel?"

Many supporters of Home Rule in the country who have advocated a federal system have advised the establishment of separate Legislative Assemblies and separate Executive Governments for Scotland, for Wales, and even for England, and the setting up of a new Imperial Parliament with some powers over the whole. Is that the plan of Home Rule at the present time? There have been indications in its favour, and there have been indications against it. Then, again, what will be the position of the Irish Representatives in the Imperial Parliament if Home Rule is passed? We know that they are in some way to be represented. What powers are they to have? Are they to have a power of voting upon English and Scotch measures, or not? That is a question of the greatest importance; and I may observe that it is particularly important and most interesting to the Government of Mr. Gladstone, if he comes into Office in a few days from this time, because your Lordships will observe that if, as I believe, there is a majority of forty in favour of Mr. Gladstone, and if the number of Irish Members is to be considerably diminished, that majority must at once vanish, and, therefore, the whole foundation upon which the measure was introduced would be taken away. I will not dwell upon any other of these matters. The problem as to what protection is to be given to the minorities with regard to land is one that is most interesting; and I should think here again my noble Friend Earl Spencer, ought to feel it his duty to explain to your Lordships before we separate what his view is as

to the protection of the minority of landed interests in Ireland. He has said over and over again that he considers that it would be extremely wrong to hand over the power over the land to a Home Rule Parliament. Is that my noble Friend's opinion now? Is that the basis upon which, if he joins it, he will join a Home Rule Government? That is a question upon which I think my noble Friend should certainly feel himself in some degree bound to give an explanation to your Lordships. My Lords, these difficulties and these objections which I have endeavoured to express are not, as I said before, the opinions of Liberal Unionists or the opinions of Conservatives; they are the opinions which have been expressed by very important Members of the Party who have confidence in Mr. Gladstone. Is this system of reticence in this House to continue? Are we the only people in this country who are to be debarred from discussing these questions? They have been discussed on the public platforms; they are being discussed now in the other House of Parliament; but your Lordships, by the adroitness of the Leader of the Opposition in this House, appear to be about to be debarred from entering into any discussion of the kind. I myself feel that it is totally against the interest of Gladstonian Peers in this House to continue this conspiracy of silence upon this matter. I think so, because I am one of those who believe that free public discussion is a safety to any Ministry who have to introduce a great and important measure. Surely it is better that the objections to that measure should be discussed beforehand rather than, as happened in 1886, a measure prepared in secrecy should be introduced, and the faults only found in it after it had been actually introduced into Parliament. If the objections which can be raised by those who are against the measure are sound ones, let them prevail. If they are weak ones, if an answer can be given to those objections, surely it is to the advantage of the Government, and to the advantage of the cause they advocate, that they should be able to give such answers without delay. All that I can say in conclusion is, that no doubt my noble Friends have the right to remain silent



supporters of Mr. Gladstone himself. At this present moment, I suppose, a distinguished Member of the other House of Parliament (Mr. Asquith) is moving a Vote of Want of Confidence in the Government. My Lords, Mr. Asquith made a speech, in 1886 I think it was, in which he said—I should like to use his own words—

“The Leaders of the Liberal Party would be acting wisely if they were to take the country a little more into their confidence. There ought to be a broad general outline on which the opinion of the country should be taken. If they went to the country with the vague formula of Home Rule or Local Self-Government and obtained a majority and introduced a Bill, some of their own followers would say: ‘Our electorate sent us to support Home Rule; but this is not the kind of thing they intended.’”

That is the opinion of a very distinguished lawyer, one of the keenest supporters of Mr. Gladstone; and I suppose may be taken to represent to a great extent the cultivated intelligence of the Gladstonian Party. My Lords, there is another branch of the Gladstonian Party—namely, the Labour branch. I suppose we may say that Mr. Davitt, who has been returned to Parliament, is one of the most distinguished Members of the Labour Party in the country, and is also not unconnected with Ireland. What were his views upon the subject? He wrote an article in one of the Reviews immediately after one of the Midlothian campaigns, in which he expressed the greatest dissatisfaction at the reticence in regard to the Home Rule measure of Mr. Gladstone, and he said—

“The Bill of 1886 was anti-democratic and a retrograde measure. It was a fair question for the British working men to ask Mr. Gladstone before they gave him the power of framing the next Home Rule Constitution for Ireland, what he intended to do as respects the land in that country.”

There we have a representative of the Gladstonian Party in England, and a representative of the Labour Party. Now as regards the Irish Nationalists, I presume nobody can deny that they are not aware what the Home Rule proposed by Mr. Gladstone is—at any rate not publicly. Perhaps the most able and most liberal-minded and moderate member of the Nationalist Party of Ireland is Sir Gavan Duffy, who, as

*The Earl of Northbrook*

your Lordships know very well, was one of the Leaders in 1848 of the Revolutionary Party, who has since had a distinguished career in the Colonies, and has now come back and is taking an active interest in the furtherance of the Nationalist Party at the present time. He again complained in the strongest terms of the reticence of Mr. Gladstone in respect to the Home Rule measure. He called his complaint “The humble remonstrance of an Irish Nationalist,” and he said

“that the original plan of 1886 had been cast to the winds five years ago. It was a great mistake that Mr. Gladstone did not publish his revised scheme of Home Rule.”

He said

“that the principles and details cannot be made too plain for the encouragement of its friends and the confusion of its opponents. Nobody would think of omitting this kind of precaution in framing an agreement for the expenditure of £100. Is there any sufficient reason for omitting them in an agreement involving, not a handful of coin, but the peace and prosperity of two neighbouring nations?”

Then Sir Gavan Duffy proceeded to give seven different heads of questions to which he would like to have an answer. Not one of those questions has been answered up to the present time. He is representing the Nationalist Party; and I may sum up what I am about to say on this subject with what he ends with. We have had the representative of the English or Scotch Gladstonian Party; we have had the representative of the Labour Party; we have had the representative of the Nationalist Party; and he ends with these words—

“The House of Lords would be justified in refusing to adopt a constitutional change which has not received the sanction of the people, unless full explanations of this kind have been given.”

Now, my Lords, are we never in this House to be taken into the confidence of the Leaders of the Opposition? After five or six years have they not now made up their minds upon what Home Rule is to be, and are they not able to explain it to us at the present time? My Lords, I am not going to argue the question of Home Rule now; but I think it is as well to recollect what kind of questions

those are to which we have had no answers.

"Is the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament to consist merely in the power of repealing a law which creates Home Rule in Ireland; or is that supremacy to confer some power to the Imperial Parliament to remedy what the Imperial Parliament may consider to be an injustice, either legislative or executive, in Ireland?"

We have had no answer to that question. That question is by no means a question of detail; it is a question of principle.

"Is Home Rule to be confined to Ireland, or is it to be extended to the other side of St. George's Channel?"

Many supporters of Home Rule in the country who have advocated a federal system have advised the establishment of separate Legislative Assemblies and separate Executive Governments for Scotland, for Wales, and even for England, and the setting up of a new Imperial Parliament with some powers over the whole. Is that the plan of Home Rule at the present time? There have been indications in its favour, and there have been indications against it. Then, again, what will be the position of the Irish Representatives in the Imperial Parliament if Home Rule is passed? We know that they are in some way to be represented. What powers are they to have? Are they to have a power of voting upon English and Scotch measures, or not? That is a question of the greatest importance; and I may observe that it is particularly important and most interesting to the Government of Mr. Gladstone, if he comes into Office in a few days from this time, because your Lordships will observe that if, as I believe, there is a majority of forty in favour of Mr. Gladstone, and if the number of Irish Members is to be considerably diminished, that majority must at once vanish, and, therefore, the whole foundation upon which the measure was introduced would be taken away. I will not dwell upon any other of these matters. The problem as to what protection is to be given to the minorities with regard to land is one that is most interesting; and I should think here again my noble Friend Earl Spencer, ought to feel it his duty to explain to your Lordships before we separate what his view is as

to the protection of the minority of landed interests in Ireland. He has said over and over again that he considers that it would be extremely wrong to hand over the power over the land to a Home Rule Parliament. Is that my noble Friend's opinion now? Is that the basis upon which, if he joins it, he will join a Home Rule Government? That is a question upon which I think my noble Friend should certainly feel himself in some degree bound to give an explanation to your Lordships. My Lords, these difficulties and these objections which I have endeavoured to express are not, as I said before, the opinions of Liberal Unionists or the opinions of Conservatives; they are the opinions which have been expressed by very important Members of the Party who have confidence in Mr. Gladstone. Is this system of reticence in this House to continue? Are we the only people in this country who are to be debarred from discussing these questions? They have been discussed on the public platforms; they are being discussed now in the other House of Parliament; but your Lordships, by the adroitness of the Leader of the Opposition in this House, appear to be about to be debarred from entering into any discussion of the kind. I myself feel that it is totally against the interest of Gladstonian Peers in this House to continue this conspiracy of silence upon this matter. I think so, because I am one of those who believe that free public discussion is a safety to any Ministry who have to introduce a great and important measure. Surely it is better that the objections to that measure should be discussed beforehand rather than, as happened in 1886, a measure prepared in secrecy should be introduced, and the faults only found in it after it had been actually introduced into Parliament. If the objections which can be raised by those who are against the measure are sound ones, let them prevail. If they are weak ones, if an answer can be given to those objections, surely it is to the advantage of the Government, and to the advantage of the cause they advocate, that they should be able to give such answers without delay. All that I can say in conclusion is, that no doubt my noble Friends have the right to remain silent

on the present occasion ; they have a right to decline to discuss anything in this House ; no one can force them to open their mouths upon the subject ; but, if they decline any discussion, I am sure your Lordships will feel that the responsibility of declining it rests upon them, and that their so declining it may possibly be a great injury to the interests of the country.

\*THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN :

My Lords, I desire to say one or two words to the House, owing to the very deep interest which I take in the present political situation. We are not all of us so deficient in imagination as the noble Earl who leads the Opposition has declared himself to be to-night ; we can see a little beyond the four corners of the Queen's Speech, and we know its purpose ; we know that it was designed with regard to events which have happened elsewhere, and with the purpose and the intention of giving an opportunity to the Opposition to challenge the policy and the existence of Her Majesty's Government. It is quite true that it may be right not to take any step of that kind in this House. I am not altogether certain though whether, if the battalions behind the noble Earl were a little more numerous than they are at present, we should not have seen Her Majesty's Speech approached and treated in a somewhat different way. My Lords, if it were in our power to look through these walls into another place, we should discover I think a very different state of things. We should find that there it is found easy, and not only easy but profitable, to move an Amendment ; and there it is found possible and profitable to discuss the policy of Her Majesty's Government. Now, my Lords, it is a fact which none of us dispute that in this House there are very few who are in favour of the policy of Home Rule, and the reason is not that there has been any change of opinion on our part, but because only a few Peers have followed noble Lords who sit on the front Bench in changing all their opinions and sentiments with regard to this question of Home Rule, which, up to a few years ago, had been the opinions of all responsible politicians of every kind and sort. Now, my

Lords, to-night we are treated to a continuance of the policy of silence. It is a policy to which we have become accustomed ; it is the policy which has been observed carefully during the whole of the last six years. It is quite true that outside this House noble Lords have expressed their opinion very freely with regard to the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and with regard to the administration of that Act by the Government. From a public point of view it appears to me that it would have been advantageous if they had brought before this House, for examination and discussion, some of the Acts of the Government to which they have so much objected in other places. My Lords, there is no better place than this House for the consideration of matters of that kind. It is not a question of minorities here ; but, if any Member of the House has facts and arguments which carry with them any force, there is no assembly which is more ready to listen to him than this House. My Lords, this Government's policy, to which they have taken exception, holds the field ; it has disappointed all the prophecies which were whispered in this House, and which were repeated much more loudly in the country. I know it has been said that there was no exceptional state of crime in Ireland in 1887. I never was able to understand how those who made that statement justified it. This I do know : that in 1887 there were nearly five thousand persons who were wholly or partially boycotted in Ireland, which I suppose everyone in this House will admit to be a crime, and that at the present time, owing to the administration of that Act, there is not a single person in that condition in Ireland. But that is not all, my Lords. The Act is not at the present time in operation in any part of Ireland ; there is not a district in Ireland which is proclaimed ; there is not a person in prison under those clauses of the Act. And that is the state of things which Her Majesty's Government will hand over to their successors when they follow them. And there the Act remains. It has been effectual in the hands of the present Government ; it is now upon the shelf ; but it remains a weapon

*The Earl of Northbrook*

ready for use if any future Government should find that they are unable to preserve peace and order in Ireland by ordinary means. My Lords, the noble Earl has told us that they have often stated in this House their general opinions of Home Rule, and that it is needless to repeat them. They may have stated their opinions in a very general way, but they have done nothing else; and until February next, under the most favourable circumstances, supposing that this Government leaves Office, Parliament will have no means whatsoever of knowing what the policy of Home Rule is which is to be substituted for the present policy; nor will they know whether Mr. Gladstone commands a majority in Parliament upon this question. Hitherto all statements have been made in vague and general terms. Well, the time will come when in February next it must be embodied in a Bill, and that Bill will have to satisfy men belonging to different Parties and holding the most different opinions. Reference has been made to-night to a gentleman who we have reason to suppose is, in another place, moving an Amendment expressing no confidence in Her Majesty's Government—Mr. Asquith; he represents a Scottish constituency, and, as an illustration of what I was saying, I may adduce his name. He and Mr. T. P. O'Connor appeared on a platform together to make speeches with regard to Home Rule, and they were asked, each of them separately, to define what were to be the powers of the Imperial Parliament. Mr. Asquith said

**"that the Imperial Parliament is to retain absolute and paramount powers of legislating for the Irish Parliament if necessary."**

And Mr. O'Connor, when he was asked, said

**"the Imperial Parliament is to have full control, so far as Imperial affairs are concerned."**

A countryman of mine, who was heckling them, pointed out to them the difference between these two answers, and Mr. Asquith's reply was that he was not responsible for Mr. O'Connor's opinions. Yes, my Lords, but the time will come when both of those gentlemen will be responsible for the measure of

Home Rule which is to be submitted to Parliament. They entertain entirely different views no doubt at the present time, and the question is, how are their views going to be reconciled, and can they be put in such a shape as not to interfere with the supremacy of Parliament? My Lords, it is almost unnecessary to glance at the present state of political Parties. Mr. Gladstone leads, not a Party but a collection of Parties; those who advocate an eight-hours day, those who are in favour of Disestablishment, those who are extreme supporters of temperance; and what they are looking to is their own views in the first instance, and Home Rule only to some extent in the second; and what may be the effect of the policy of Home Rule upon the country they appear, judging from their utterances, to care very little. My Lords, we know there is no majority in Great Britain in favour of Home Rule; we know that the opposition in Ireland is strong and is every day growing; and, moreover, we know that the strength of that opposition is not to be measured by the number of Members of Parliament whom even at the present time they return. Now, my Lords, this is all I propose to say on the present occasion. I do not think it is a time for going deeply into these matters; but, if nothing were said, it might be supposed in the country that this House does not take a very deep interest in a question which is of the most vital importance to the British Empire. It has been sufficient, I think, to point out, so far as I have done, some of the anomalies of the present position. It is sufficient now merely to glance at the vague responsibility which noble Lords on the Front Benches are prepared to take; and it is only necessary to add that the measure which they have in contemplation is one of extreme gravity and importance; it amounts to nothing less than a re-casting of our Constitution; and it is quite right that the body of this House—that we the ordinary Members of the House—should represent that, if at any time that measure should be produced in this House, it will be our duty to submit it to the most careful and searching examination.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): I rise, my Lords, in the first instance to perform the grateful task of thanking the two noble Lords behind me for the manner in which they have performed a duty which the noble Earl opposite is perfectly right in designating as one of unusual difficulty. Especially my noble Friend who moved the Address gave us ground for hoping that there is added to this House one who in future discussions will illustrate the eloquence for which it is well known. But, my Lords, I feel that I owe almost an apology to my noble Friends for the difficulty which they have encountered in the task they have had to perform. It is said that when a great King of Prussia wished to test the ability of a new clergyman he gave him the text from which he was to preach wrapped up in an envelope, to be opened in the pulpit, and, when he came to open it, he found there was nothing inside. I feel that there was something, perhaps, of that difficulty in the task which it was my duty to set my noble Friends; but the skill with which they extricated themselves from that difficulty, and the interesting manner in which they surveyed the political situation in which we find ourselves, deserves, I think, more than the ordinary perfunctory acknowledgments that we pay. But I cannot agree with the noble Earl opposite that I have departed from the precedents which have been set. There is no precedent for the present occasion. In 1841, the precedent to which the noble Earl alluded, it is perfectly true that the Speech did go into the measures which it was proposed that Parliament should discuss, but it did it for the very good reason that there were some measures which it was proposed Parliament should discuss. In consequence of the state of foreign affairs and operations that had been going on, the Government was in considerable financial difficulty, and it was necessary that ways and means should be found for defraying the expenses that had been incurred. Finding ways and means at that juncture was not a very easy matter, and the proposal naturally led Ministers, through the mouth of

the Sovereign, to discuss those difficult questions of fiscal adjustment which were then coming up for arrangement, and the Speech went largely into the question of fiscal policy. It did so because there were measures of fiscal policy to be passed; and, if the noble Lord really thinks that that occasion was a precedent, I would ask him to remember that in the Debate which followed Members who were then in Opposition were not at all chary of giving at great length and with perfect clearness their opinions as to the burning questions of the day. My Lords, I confess that, as we have no measures to recommend to Parliament at this moment, and as, if it had not been for the necessity of allowing the other House to pronounce its opinion on the question of Confidence, Parliament would have been immediately prorogued, I should have been disposed, on the whole, to advise the abandonment of the formality of the Queen's Speech altogether; but the rugged Conservatism of noble Lords opposite, I found, was opposed to any such deviation from precedent, and, of course, it could only be done by general consent. My Lords, I do not think I can very properly defend the policy of the Government, because it has not been attacked, and if I were to select any particular part for defence people would say, "You show that you think that is the part that most requires it," because there has been no attack in order to guide the course which the defence should take; and, therefore, I shall not enter upon any such defence. Though I quite understand that independent Peers should survey the situation, should express their opinions, and should urge the course which they think ought to be adopted by the Opposition in the present instance, I do not think that the Government would be acting according to the duty that would be expected of them in entering upon a detailed vindication of the policy which the authorised opponents of that policy, who are called further south the advocates of the devil, have not themselves thought it necessary to attack. I would, at the same time, express some little surprise at the reticence which noble Lords have thought it necessary to practise.

That is a matter for their own judgment, and I do not in the least complain of it; but I am surprised at it, because I should have thought they would have wished to defend opinions to which they are deeply attached before a body representing, as this does, the opinion of the island in which we live. It is quite true the House of Commons represents the opinion of the United Kingdom, but we live in days when matters are viewed separately from the standpoints of Great Britain and Ireland, and, adopting that current tone, I am forced to call attention to the fact that, while the House of Commons represents the opinion of the United Kingdom, the House of Lords represents the opinion of Great Britain a great deal better than the House of Commons. Therefore, before such a tribunal, I should have thought noble Lords would have wished to vindicate their opinions. They do not do so. I do not say that this is an occasion on which they can be forced by any process of pressure or torture known to Parliamentary law to express their opinions; but we are now met in this building in order that the House of Commons may exercise a prerogative which is exclusively its own. The House of Commons, under our Constitution, as it is practised, has the exclusive determination with respect to men. When the men have been selected, afterwards will come the measures. I hope the men will be found who can agree upon the measures. But, when the measures are adopted, then the exclusive position of the House of Commons ceases, and, with respect to all matters not financial, the share which your Lordships must bear in legislation is as large as that of the House of Commons. When that comes forward there will then, I think, be no difficulty in finding occasion for debate; and, when the measures are presented to us, I presume even noble Lords opposite must abandon the conspiracy of silence. I do not expect to see them moving the First, Second, and Third Readings of their future measures in dumb-show. Therefore I quite admit that they have a right, if they will, to dam up the full tide of their eloquence until that time; I have no

doubt it will then flow with a devastating force. But I do not think that the apprehensions, which I thought seemed to glimmer through the speeches of some of my noble Friends, that the part taken by this House in these matters might become unimportant and uninteresting, are in any danger of being fulfilled. It is more likely to prophesy that in the year that is coming the centre of interest and the centre of action will be found within these walls. I hope that to that serious task and to those grave duties this House will bring the wisdom and decision to which in the past it has established a title. I trust that it will feel the enormous responsibility that it has imposed upon it by a crisis of affairs that is absolutely unexampled in this country—in a year which, whether you consider it from the point of view of the career and the character and the present position of the distinguished statesman who is leading the attack, or whether you consider it with respect to the composite and unstable nature of the majority which supports him, or whether you consider it—most important of all—with respect to the vital and fundamental nature of the changes which are shadowed forth for our acceptance, will be one of the most momentous years that has ever passed over the history of this country. We are dealing, my Lords, with a great Empire, but it is a great Empire that has not grown by natural force or in obedience to the necessary dictates of the circumstances and conditions under which it was found. It is rather an artificial fabric that has been reared by the devotion and the commanding qualities of the race which inhabits this island, and I pray that in the future we may allow no glimmer of new-found theories, no imaginary or speculative doctrines, to lead us from those great principles of thought and action by which this Empire was framed and by which alone it can be sustained.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: My Lords, it may seem somewhat presumptuous on my part to attempt to address your Lordships after the Leader of the House has addressed you, and when it might be expected that this short discussion would come to a close;

but I think that there are still some things that ought to be said, and, perhaps, may be said, better by one who is in an independent position than by any Member of Her Majesty's Government or by any immediate supporter of that Government. I must acknowledge that I have observed with some surprise the apparently willing acquiescence which Her Majesty's Ministers and their supporters have given to the policy of silence which has been adopted by the Opposition. It appears to me, in view of the events that have recently taken place, and which are taking place at this moment, that the course which has been taken on this occasion is not in accordance with the precedents and traditions of Parliament, and that it is not a course which is likely to conduce to the benefit of the country. The noble Earl who leads the Opposition has said that in Her Majesty's Speech he finds nothing to criticise; but the occasion of an Address to the Crown in answer to Her Majesty's Speech is usually an occasion not merely for criticism on the Speech itself, but is also a fitting opportunity for criticism upon the policy of the Government; and I presume that, when my noble Friend says that he finds nothing to criticise in the Speech, we may also assume from his silence that he finds nothing to criticise in the policy of the Government. The noble Earl said that the opinions which are held by himself and his friends as to the policy of the Government are well known; but the time has arrived when effect is about to be given to those opinions in another place, and I presume that there, at all events, some reasons will be given for the Vote of Want of Confidence which is going to be moved; and it appears to me to be a mark of some disrespect to this House that reasons which are to be alleged in another place to show why the country has no confidence, or ought to have no confidence, in the Government, are to be entirely withheld here from our discussion. My Lords, everyone who has spoken in this extremely brief discussion has referred to the fact that we stand in a position which is without any precedent; but that position has been brought about in a great degree in

consequence of the exertions of my noble Friends behind me and their friends in the other House of Parliament; and it does appear to me that this occasion is one on which it would have been desirable that some explanation should have been given by them as to the course which they have thought fit to take in the country, and that some indication should be given as to the policy which will be adopted in the event, as is probable, of their friends coming into power. It seems to be assumed very generally that two facts have been established by the General Election — first, that Her Majesty's Government does not possess the confidence of the country or of the House of Commons, who represent it; and next, that Mr. Gladstone does possess that confidence. It is possible — in fact, it is very probable — that the first of these propositions will very shortly be conclusively proved by the Debate and Division in the House of Commons; but the second of those propositions, which is also apparently so calmly assumed, does not in any degree follow. It is possible and probable that the various sections which compose the majority in the House of Commons may combine in order to vote a want of confidence in the present Government; but it is not by any means a matter of course that they will combine also and give their support and confidence to the Government which may be formed to take its place. As a matter of fact, I believe it is the case that the present Government is supported in the House of Commons itself by a much larger number of Members than are prepared to give a constant or unconditional support to any other political Leader. Under these circumstances it would appear natural that Her Majesty's Government, being supported by a larger number of the Representatives of the people than any other section, should continue to hold Office until it has been proved that one or more sections of the House of Commons will not only combine for the purpose of turning out the present Administration, but for the purpose of supporting the new one. No one, I suppose, will contend for a moment that either the Labour Members

or the Irish Members — Parnellite or Anti-Parnellite—not to speak of the Scotch and English Members, have been elected on any understanding or on any pledge of giving an unconditional support to the policy of Mr. Gladstone. It is only by a combination of those Parties that a new Government can be formed and can remain in Office, and it is only by such a combination that a permanent Government can be secured. I think we are entitled under these circumstances to ask, in the first place—I think the question has been already suggested by one of my noble Friends behind me—whether, in the event of the present Administration being displaced and a new one formed by Mr. Gladstone, Parliament will be immediately summoned in order to hear a full statement of the views of the new Government, and to take measures to ascertain whether that Government possesses the confidence of the House of Commons. If that course should not be taken the country and Parliament may be placed in this position, as has already been pointed out—that the affairs of the country may for a period of five or six months be conducted by an Administration which, when the question is brought to the test, will be found not to possess, and not to have possessed at any time, the confidence of a majority of the House of Commons. I suppose it would be considered a very unconstitutional act for Her Majesty's Government to remain in Office after a Vote of Want of Confidence had been carried; there is, I believe, no Constitutional principle which would compel them to abandon Office under such circumstances until they found it impossible to obtain from Parliament the necessary Supplies for carrying on the Government; I conceive that if Her Majesty's Government were to take that course, we should hear a good deal of the unconstitutional nature of the proceeding; but the state of things which may arise, if Parliament is not going to be summoned to meet again for five or six months, may be a state of things not very unlike that which would arise under the circumstances that I have suggested. The only difference would be that Her Majesty's Government would have been made aware that they do

not possess the confidence of the majority of the House; but in the other case Mr. Gladstone will not be able to give any proof, until Parliament has assembled, that he does possess that confidence. Well, my Lords, if, as I presume, there is no intention of giving any pledge that Parliament will be summoned at an early date to place these facts in a position of certainty, I fully admit that we are not, in this House or in the other House, in a position to exact such a pledge; but it follows that there is all the more reason why, at the present time, before a decisive vote upon this question is taken, the fullest explanation should be given, both, in my opinion, to this House and to the other, of the reasons which induce the Members of the Opposition to think it necessary to turn out the Government, and the fullest indications possible should be given of the policy they intend to pursue in the event of their succeeding the present Government in Office. I cannot doubt, my Lords, that such explanations and such indications will be given in the other House. If they are to be given in the other House, I ask, why are they not to be given in this House? I was surprised to hear my noble Friend explain his reticence and that of his friends by the plea that no action was being taken in this House. My noble Friends are not acting in accordance with the precedents of their own Party. I believe the nearest, the most recent, and the closest precedent for that which is taking place at present occurred in 1859. I had the honour of being selected to move a Vote of Want of Confidence in the Government in the other House of Parliament. On that occasion no such Motion was moved in this House.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: Hear, hear!

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: My noble Friend says "Hear, hear!" but the course which was taken by his predecessor in the Leadership, Lord Granville, was not the course which he is taking on this occasion. In this House, Lord Granville, as the Leader of the Opposition, arraigned the conduct of the Government in a speech precisely similar to that which would have been made if he and his friends had thought it expedient to move a



Vote of Want of Confidence in this House. A Debate followed, and every charge which could be made against the then existing Administration was made in this House as fully as it was made in the other House. Every question which could be asked as to the possibility of forming a stable Government to succeed that which was being ejected was replied to and discussed as fully in this House as if a Vote of Want of Confidence had been before it. Well, my Lords, I do not understand why this precedent should not have been followed on this occasion. I do not understand, unless my noble Friends are prepared to recognise in this House no Constitutional authority, unless in their opinion the time has come when it is hereafter to take no effective part in the government of the country, how they can reconcile it with their duty to pursue the policy of silence which they have pursued in this House—a policy which is altogether different from that which we have reason to believe is being pursued in another place. My noble Friend says that no action is being taken in this House. I do not suppose he and those who act with him will deny that the action which is being taken in the other House is being taken with their advice and on their counsel. They will not deny that they are prepared to take advantage of anything that may result from that action. They will not deny that they are prepared to accept such offices as may be assigned in a future Government to Members of the House of Lords; and, as they have in these ways made themselves responsible for the action which is being taken at the present moment in the House of Commons, I do not understand how they can reconcile to themselves the absolute silence which they have observed in this House as to the reasons which have induced them to give that advice and to take that course. My Lords, in this total absence of any information on the part of the Opposition, we can only endeavour to ascertain for ourselves from their previous declarations and from previous discussions what are the grounds upon which Parliament is going to be asked to displace the present Government, and to gather some indications of the policy which their

successors are likely to pursue. I will not take up your Lordships' time by discussing the grounds on which it is possible, though I do not think probable, that any Vote of Want of Confidence will be demanded. I do not think it likely that the grounds which will be brought forward will rest upon a condemnation of the general policy of the Government. I do not anticipate that either the foreign, colonial, or Indian policy of the Government will be impugned, or that it will be alleged that it has been weak, unwise, or unsuccessful. I do not conceive it likely that the administration of any of the great Departments of the State will be impugned. If any of these allegations are now to be made they will be made for the first time in a period of six years, for I believe that neither in this House nor the other House has any Motion involving confidence in the Government upon questions of general policy been as much as moved or suggested. But, my Lords, I think, when we are on the eve of a change of Government, there is one question which we have a right to ask from those who acknowledge that they are prepared to accept the responsibilities of Office, relating to foreign affairs. Although the conduct of foreign affairs by the Government has not been attacked, yet we have heard from time to time hints more or less obscure, more or less clear, that the time has come when a different policy is to be pursued in Egypt from that which has hitherto been pursued. We have had from not unimportant authorities suggestions that the time has arrived, if it has not already passed, when the evacuation of Egypt by Her Majesty's Forces ought to take place. Now, at the time when a new Government is about to take Office, and when it is probable that Parliament may not meet for five or six months, I think we have a right to know whether the Members of the Opposition, on whom the real responsibility for the government of this country is about to rest, have as yet formed an opinion that the time has come for the evacuation of Egypt; and whether any undertaking will be given that no steps will be taken which will irrevocably and irretrievably pledge the honour of

this country on that subject, until Parliament shall have had some opportunity of expressing its opinion either upon the subject of evacuation or the conditions under which that evacuation is to be carried out. My Lords, if it is unlikely, as I think it is, that the general policy of the Government is going to be impugned, is their administration of the government of Ireland going to be impugned? If these events had taken place two or three years ago, I think there is little doubt that the administration of the government of Ireland would have been the main if not the only ground on which the House of Commons would have been asked to vote the condemnation of the Government. The severity, the rigour, the alleged injustice and cruelty with which the Crimes Act was administered formed the perpetual subject of Resolutions of Want of Confidence in the other House; and if a great and remarkable change had not taken place in that country since that time, I have no doubt that a similar Resolution would have formed the ground of the action of the Opposition on this occasion. If your Lordships will allow me, I will read one specimen of the numerous Motions of Censure upon that subject which were moved in the other House. In 1888 Mr. John Morley moved—

“That, in the opinion of this House, the operation of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1837, and the manner of its administration undermine respect for law, estrange the minds of the people of Ireland, and are deeply injurious to the interests of the United Kingdom.”

Your Lordships will observe that that Resolution was aimed not merely at the existence on the Statute Book of that Act, but at its operation and the manner of its administration. I will read one or two sentences from the speech of Mr. John Morley supporting that Resolution—

“How long, I ask, is this to go on? Under such a system as this, a system which has alienated and is alienating the minds of the people from the law and throwing all their sympathies on the side of the offenders against the law, under that system no civil virtue can ever grow or ever thrive. . . . I say that the state of Ireland is becoming, not better from day to-day, but is becoming worse. I think that before many months are passed, if

you test those propositions by all that comes up from Ireland, you will see the necessity for doing away with a system which is deepening the confusion in Ireland, and which tarnishes the credit, the honour, and the renown of this Parliament and of the people of this country.”

I should like to ask whether such a Resolution as that, supported by such assertions and such prophecies, does not, in the light of our present knowledge of the condition of Ireland, appear to be something more than unfounded, and to be almost absurd and ridiculous? Is there any reason why we should feel confidence in placing the administration of Ireland in the hands of men who have proved what is their knowledge of the condition of Ireland, and of the influences which have sway in Ireland, by committing themselves to prophecies which have been so completely and so utterly falsified? My Lords, I think upon this subject also we are entitled to some little information. Ireland, as we have been reminded already, is at the present moment governed under no coercion at all. The mere existence of a permanent, instead of a temporary and exceptional law, has produced the effect which those who supported it always anticipated that it would produce. It has proved so efficient that it has been possible to lay aside that weapon in the armoury, and to trust to the ordinary law, which has, by its agency, been restored to the efficiency it had once lost, for the preservation of order and for the good government of Ireland. But, my Lords, if we are to judge by the perpetual denunciations of the Crimes Act which we have heard from the Members of the Opposition, one of the first Acts which they will ask Parliament to sanction will be the repeal of that law. The denunciations in which they have indulged make that almost a necessity, even if they are not bound by any understanding with the Nationalist Members, whose support is essential to the permanence of the existence of their Government. There are many noble Lords in this House who have had great experience of the government of Ireland. There is one noble Lord who sits behind me who has had greater experience in the administration of Coercion Acts probably than any other person. I should like to ask my noble Friend to whom I refer

(Earl Spencer) whether he will deliberately get up in this House and say that he prefers the existence in Ireland of such a state of crime, anarchy, and disorder as he has himself on former occasions had to cope with; whether he prefers the existence of such a paralysis of the law before and after periods of exceptional legislation, too late resorted to and too soon abandoned; whether he deliberately prefers the possibility of the existence of such a state of things in Ireland to the mere existence on the Statute Book of a law, the efficiency of which has been proved by the fact that it is no longer necessary to put it in force? There is a further question which we are entitled to ask of the noble Lords who are ready to assume the responsibility of Office: in what spirit is the ordinary law going to be administered in Ireland? During the last five or six years the Government have been constantly attacked, not only by the Irish Members, but by English Members of the Opposition, because they have not refused to give the support of the forces which the Crown can control to the officers of the law in the execution of their duty in a certain class of cases. Now we have a right to know whether or not effect is to be given to those denunciations. We have a right to know whether the law is not going to be supported if the execution of the law relates to any matter connected with the land, or whether, in spite of all they have said during the last four or five years, they are now prepared to say that, while the law remains unaltered, the law shall be obeyed, and that disobedience to the law shall not be condoned any more in agrarian than in any other class of offences or of lawlessness? We have a right to ask whether they are prepared to look on quietly while the National League revives, or attempts to revive, that agrarian war which was the curse of Ireland not long ago—whether they are prepared to take a side in that war which is not the side of law, or whether they are prepared calmly to look on while Ireland is once more reduced to that state of anarchy and disorder which had the effect of converting, first Mr. Morley, and subsequently Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues, to the

necessity of Home Rule? My Lords, if neither the general policy of the administration of the Government nor their Irish administration is likely to be made the ground on which the Government are to be condemned, I would ask whether it is their failure to meet the necessities of the country either in their past or their prospective legislation? As to their past legislation, such measures as the Local Government Act, the Free Education Act, and many others which I need not enumerate, have been admitted even by Members of the Opposition to be measures of a useful and progressive character, though, no doubt, it has been open to them to think that they would have been far better if they had been passed by other hands. As to prospective legislation, it is a matter of opinion whether the legislative policy which has been frequently indicated by the Government, and which, if they had obtained the support of a majority in the country, they would have been prepared to continue in another Session of Parliament, is a more useful, more timely legislative policy than that which is embodied in the Newcastle programme. I should be very much surprised, if we could induce some of my noble Friends who sit behind me to enter into a perfectly confidential and unofficial discussion on these subjects, to find that they are very strongly convinced of the superiority of the legislative programme which embraces a new Reform Bill, Disestablishment, and the other miscellaneous items of the Newcastle Programme, the London Programme, and the agricultural labourers' programme. I should be much surprised to find that they have any enthusiastic preference for those measures of legislation over the continuation of local government reform, the establishment of local government in Ireland, and the other social reforms which have been promised by Her Majesty's Government. But I do not entertain the slightest doubt that the Elections have been influenced to some, perhaps to a considerable, extent by promises of extensive and far-reaching legislation on a variety of subjects; and it would be interesting to know, now that the time for making promises has passed, when nothing more is to be

gained by promises, but when the time for performance is approaching rather more closely, whether, either in the form of Resolutions to be moved in the other House, or in the form of declarations by responsible Members of the Opposition, those pledges are going now to be renewed which they have been so freely making for themselves in the country, and which their followers and supporters have been undertaking in their name to a still greater degree? But, my Lords, whatever may be the pledges which the Opposition are going to give on the subject of their future legislation, there are none of them relating to Imperial legislation affecting the three kingdoms which will be able to maintain them in power for a single day, after once they have met Parliament, unless they are prepared, at the same time, to redeem the pledges which they have given to the Irish Members for the establishment of an Irish Parliament and an Irish Parliamentary Government. The Members of the Opposition are deeply pledged to the Irish people and the Irish Members, but they are not less pledged to the people of Great Britain. They have pledged themselves that any Parliamentary form of government which they will concede to Ireland shall be one which shall in no degree impair the authority of the Imperial Parliament. I am not going to waste your Lordships' time by asking for any assurance from my noble Friends as to the nature of the Home Rule measure which they contemplate introducing. I refrain from asking these questions, not because I think we have not a perfect right to ask them, but because I feel perfectly certain that they will obtain no answer. I think we have a right to ask a good deal more. I think we have a right to ask how the pledges to which I have referred, pledges which seem to me to be absolutely incompatible, are to be reconciled. We have a right to be told whether the Government which it is proposed to establish in Ireland is to be a sort of dual independence, or a system of federal or colonial autonomy. We have a right to know whether they adhere to the opinion which they held six years ago, that to deal simultaneously with the Irish law and with

the position of Irish landlords is an obligation of honour and of justice. We have a right, above all, to know in what manner the claims of the Protestants of Ulster—claims which six years ago were admitted to exist, and which in the present year have been put forward with far greater distinctness and clearness than in any previous period—are going to be recognised. But, as I have said, I refrain from putting these questions, not in the belief that we have not a perfect right to demand explanations upon them before the Government of this country is placed in other hands, but because I know that it is absolutely impossible to obtain information upon them. We have done our best to induce the people of this country to require that no Minister shall receive authority to re-open the question of Irish Government until he has made some more explicit declarations as to the nature of the Government which he proposes to set up. I regret that we have failed in those endeavours. I regret it, because I believe that to re-open the question of Irish Government will have the effect of unsettling Ireland, of delaying the progress which is going on, and of checking the prosperity which is beginning to appear. I regret it, because I believe that to re-open the question of Irish Government will bring back the disorder and perhaps the misery which has been undergone in that country within the last few years. I regret it, because I think that such an attempt, in the absence of the explicit declarations for which we have asked in vain, cannot in its nature be a final settlement of the question. It can only have the effect of wasting the time of Parliament, and of preventing it from paying attention to those other matters of social reform with which otherwise it would be able to deal. But, my Lords, these are the only reasons for which I regret that failure of our endeavours to elicit some more explicit pledges from the Members of the Opposition. If they had had more courage—if they had been willing to risk more—it is possible that they might have gained more. If they had thought fit to take the people of this country into their confidence, and had given the general principles and outlines of the measure they proposed to intro-

duce, and after this had defeated us, it would have been possible for them to say that they had obtained something like an expression of the feeling of the people upon this subject. Now they have obtained nothing except leave to attempt again to do that which they have already attempted once and have conspicuously failed in doing. No Irish Representative sits in the House of Commons who is pledged to his constituents to accept any measure which may be offered to him. No Member for any British constituency is pledged to his constituents to offer anything which may be asked. It will be the right and it will be the duty of every Member of Parliament, of either House, to form his own independent judgment on any measure which may be submitted to him and, what is more, he has no authority from his constituents either to accept or offer any measure of Irish Government in their name. The measure which will come before this Parliament can by no possibility bear upon its face the stamp of the deliberate approval or judgment of the people. It will be the duty of this House, as well as of the other House, to form its own judgment on such a measure when it comes before it, not only upon its merits, but upon the extent to which it deserves or is likely to obtain the deliberate acceptance of this nation. My Lords, these are subjects upon which the members of the Opposition would, I think, have lost nothing if they had thought fit to give us some explanation of their views upon the present occasion. They have not thought fit to do so, and in the omission of the discharge of that duty, which will no doubt be effectually discharged in another place, I humbly submit to your Lordships that they have been wanting in that respect which is due to the Assembly of which we are members.

LORD HERSHELL: My Lords, although I propose to address a few observations to your Lordships, I am afraid they will not afford any satisfaction to the noble Duke who has just sat down. I only rise to assure your Lordships, if you need such assurance—to assure the noble Duke that it is from no want of respect to this House that we have taken the course which

we have thought it right to adopt. No doubt that course is open to such criticism as the noble Duke or anyone else may please to pass upon it, and, so far as that criticism is just and wise either in this House or outside of it, we shall no doubt reap the disadvantage which we may incur by having taken the course which we have done and which we propose to take. But I entirely deny that the noble Duke has been able to allude to any precedent which justifies the observation that we are departing from the course which has been taken on previous occasions. The noble Duke alludes to 1859 and to the discussion which took place on that occasion. But he did not call your Lordships' attention to the fact that the Queen's Speech at that time bore no sort of resemblance to the Queen's Speech to which we have listened to-day. I suppose he read the speech made on that occasion by the late Lord Granville as leading the Opposition; and if he read it he would have seen how the observations which were made by the noble Earl were largely dictated by the situation which then existed, and to which allusion was made in the Speech of Her Majesty on that occasion, and that the speech was one which naturally followed the declaration of policy on the part of the then Government—a declaration which is entirely wanting on the present occasion. But where, I should like to know, is the noble Duke's precedent for questions put, as questions have been put to-day, not to those who are in Office and have the responsibility of Office upon them, but to those who are under no responsibility at this moment? We, my Lords, are private members of your Lordships' House, and are no more subject to be criticised than the noble Duke or any other member of this House who may be sitting on these Benches. The noble Duke has alluded to a variety of questions. I have observed that every one of the noble Lords who has touched upon this question of Home Rule, and who has invited us to make full declarations upon it, has said that he was not about to do so, and that this was not the time to discuss the matter.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: I did not say so.

*The Duke of Devonshire*

LORD HERSCHELL: The noble Duke says he did not say so, but all those who preceded him did.

EARL COWPER: I did not say so.

LORD HERSCHELL: I heard the noble Lords, Lord Northbrook and Lord Camperdown, say so. About the other two I am not sure; but that is two out of four.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I said that this was not the time to enter upon a discussion of the whole question of Home Rule; but I did not say that it was not the time for the noble Lords to make a declaration.

LORD HERSCHELL: No doubt; and anything more mischievous, anything more misleading, and anything more likely to do injury to the country than partial declarations upon a great question it is impossible to conceive. If we could go into the whole question it would be intelligible that we should be asked to do so. But when it is admitted that we cannot, and when we are invited to make declarations upon the explicit parts selected by noble Lords themselves, I say that we have a duty which we must discharge as best we may. I observe that the noble Lord (Lord Northbrook) constantly spoke of "those on the Treasury Bench." He was under the supposition that we had already changed sides. I quite admit that then his questions would have been pertinent and just; but he has forgotten the not immaterial fact that at present we are sitting on this Bench and are under no such responsibilities as those with which he has invested us. What course ought we to take under such circumstances as these? We must take that course which we think is least likely to create difficulties and to render us less able properly to discharge the duties which devolve upon us, if ever they should devolve upon us. The noble Duke says that they have a right to ask such questions as they please. No doubt they have. But I venture to suggest that there is a right which we possess equally with that right, a correlative right, and that is the right not to answer them, and that right is one which we are just as much justified in exercising, and just as much possessed

of, as those who put the questions. No doubt the noble Duke and noble Earls have dealt with questions of a very serious character. I do not deny their gravity for a moment. Who can doubt that anyone who may hereafter become Her Majesty's Ministers, and who have to deal with such subjects as the noble Lords have dwelt upon, must do so under the deepest possible sense of responsibility; and I have been asking myself, while this discussion has been going on, what object there was in view in making the speeches to which your Lordships have listened. Was it a solicitude for our interests, a desire to assist us in the task which they think we may hereafter be called upon to perform? Did they think that if they asked those questions, and dwelt upon those matters which they put as points of great difficulty, and as requiring much care and discrimination in their answers—did they think that if on the moment we were, as they proposed, to give them these answers, it would assist us, supposing that duty should devolve upon us which they seem to anticipate is likely? I cannot think so. I have no doubt that they are extremely solicitous for our welfare personally, but beyond that I doubt if they have any solicitude about us at all. I believe they would desire to throw every obstacle in our path, to make every difficulty that is going to rest upon our shoulders infinitely more difficult, and to render the task that they suggest is likely to devolve upon us as difficult of performance as possible. All that is right and fair enough, but if they have made these speeches in that spirit with that object in view, thinking that if they could induce us to answer to the call and make the declarations, not that the country would gain—I do not for a moment understand how that would be likely to be the case, and there was hardly a suggestion of it—but how we might be placed in a more difficult position, then it is obviously quite competent for us to think, and we do think, that the best way in which we can discharge our duty at the present time, and the duties that now devolve upon us, is not to enter upon these discussions and not to make declarations which might mislead

## CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

The Earl of MORLEY appointed, *nemine dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session.

COMMITTEE FOR PRIVILEGES — Appointed.

SUB-COMMITTEE FOR THE JOURNALS — Appointed.

STOPPAGES IN THE STREETS — Order to prevent, renewed.

APPEAL COMMITTEE — Appointed.

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow. Eleven o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 8th August, 1892.

The House met at One of the clock.

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath; and one other Member made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners;—

The House went;—and being returned;—

## NEW WRIT.

For the Borough of Finsbury (Holborn Division), *v.* Gainsford Bruce, esquire, Q.C., one of the Justices of the High Court.

## ELECTIONS (CORK CITY, AND CORK COUNTY, NORTH EAST DIVISION).

\*MR. SPEAKER acquainted the House that he had received a Letter from Mr. William O'Brien, returned as Member for the City of Cork and also for the North East Division of Cork County, making his election to serve for the City of Cork, as followeth:—

6th August, 1892.

Sir,

Having been returned as Member of this House for two constituencies, namely,—Cork City and the North East Division of Cork County, I beg to inform you that I intend to take my seat for the City of Cork.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

WILLIAM O'BRIEN.

Right Hon. Arthur Peel, M.P.,

Speaker.

## ELECTIONS.

Ordered, That all Members who are returned for two or more places in any part of the United Kingdom do make their election for which of the places they will serve, within one week after it shall appear that there is no question upon the Return for that place; and if anything shall come in question touching the Return or Election of any Member, he is to withdraw during the time the matter is in debate; and that all Members returned upon double Returns do withdraw till their Returns are determined.

Resolved, That no Peer of the Realm, except such Peers of Ireland as shall for the time being be actually elected, and shall not have declined to serve, for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, hath any right to give his vote in the Election of any Member to serve in Parliament.

## Resolution proposed,

"That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom for any Lord of Parliament, or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to concern himself in the Election of Members to serve for the Commons in Parliament, except only any Peer of Ireland, at such Elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a Candidate, or by himself, or any others, be proposed to be elected; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the Election of any Member to serve for the Commons in Parliament."

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth): Before this is carried, Mr. Speaker, may I ask you whether the House has any means of enforcing this Resolution?

\*MR. SPEAKER: It is scarcely a point of Order upon which the hon. Baronet asks me the question. No case has arisen; but if the hon. Baronet knows of any instance in which it is alleged such Order has been infringed it is for him to bring such case before

the House, and for the House to take such action as it may think proper.

Resolution agreed to.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been elected or returned a Member of this House, or endeavoured so to be, by Bribery, or any other corrupt practices, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against all such persons as shall have been wilfully concerned in such Bribery or other corrupt practices.

#### WITNESSES.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been tampering with any Witness, in respect of his evidence to be given to this House, or any Committee thereof, or directly or indirectly hath endeavoured to defer or hinder any person from appearing or giving evidence, the same is declared to be a high crime and misdemeanor; and this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath given false evidence in any case before this House, or any Committee thereof, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

#### METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Ordered, That the Commissioners of the Police of the Metropolis do take care that, during the Session of Parliament, the passages through the streets leading to this House be kept free and open, and that no obstruction be permitted to hinder the passage of Members to and from this House, and that no disorder be allowed in Westminster Hall, or in the passages leading to this House, during the sitting of Parliament, and that there be no annoyance therein or thereabouts; and that the Serjeant at Arms attending this House do communicate this Order to the Commissioners aforesaid.

#### VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Ordered, That the Votes and Proceedings of this House be printed, being first perused by Mr. Speaker; and that he do appoint the printing thereof; and that no person but such as he shall appoint do presume to print the same.

#### PRIVILEGES.

Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed.

#### OUTLAWRIES BILL

Bill "for the more effectual preventing Clandestine Outlawries," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### JOURNAL.

Ordered, That the Journal of this House, from the end of the last Session to the end of the present Session, with an Index thereto, be printed.

Ordered, That 750 Copies of the said Journal and Index be printed by the appointment and under the direction of Reginald Francis Douce Palgrave, esquire, C.B., the Clerk of this House.

Ordered, That the said Journal and Index be printed by such Person as shall be licensed by Mr. Speaker, and that no other Person do presume to print the same.

#### MOTION.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (BILLS).

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I beg to move, as a matter of general convenience—

"That during the present sittings of the House no Notices be received of Motions for leave to bring in Bills."

Resolution agreed to.

#### THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

MR. SPEAKER reported Her Majesty's Speech delivered by Her CHANCELLOR, and read it to the House. —(See page 21.)

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

\*(4.25.) MR. BARTON (Armagh, Mid.) (who wore the Court Dress of an Irish Queen's Counsel, but without wig and gown): I rise to move that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty in reply to Her Majesty's Gracious Speech. In submitting the Motion, I cannot pretend to have any doubt as to the manner in which it will be received by those who claim to have achieved a Party majority at the recent General Election. We know that the Motion will not be received by the Opposition in the usual terms of formal compliment; on the contrary, it is to be met, as we have been made aware, by an Amendment to be proposed by two of the most distinguished and respected of hon. Members opposite, embodying a Vote of Censure on the Government, and a demand for their immediate dismissal from Office. I do not in the least complain of the proposed action of hon. Gentlemen opposite, who, I venture to think, will find Her Majesty's Government ready to meet the attack and to await the judgment of the House. I shall still less



complain if they take the opportunity, as, I assume, they are prepared to do, of explaining to the House those benefits which the Party opposite are prepared to confer upon the country if placed in power. I think I may, under these exceptional circumstances, claim the special indulgence of the House while for a very brief period I stand between the House and the development of that attack, to which all Members look forward with such curiosity and interest. I cannot, under the circumstances, avoid all controversial matters, but it will be my duty, as Mover of the Address to Her Majesty, to observe the due limits of moderation, and to have regard to the general sentiments of the House. It has been said in some quarters that Her Majesty's Government ought immediately on the close of the General Election to have tendered their resignation without waiting for Debate and Division. It is not for me, though I approve of it, to justify the course Her Majesty's Ministers have taken, and I do not presume to do so; but I cannot help connecting with this suggestion reliable rumours which reach us through the same channel which suggest that while we on this side of the House approach this discussion with calmness and confidence there is not in other quarters that eagerness to develop and prolong discussion which we might expect from a triumphant majority. Such a strange and unusual situation requires explanation, and if I may venture without exceeding the limits of my task to offer an explanation, I think it is this—that there is in the breast of every hon. Member a still small voice which tells him, whether he likes it or not, that the result of the General Election is ineffective for any great legislative change, that it cannot have any permanent results, and that its mandate, if mandate there is, is confused and indistinct. Surely, then, it is fortunate that this Debate gives an opportunity to hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, which should be eagerly and fully availed of by them, to clear up this confusion, to interpret the mandate, and before the House and the country to defend and justify their interpretation. In spite of the threatened attack upon the

Government, which, we are informed, is about to open, it is fortunate that there are some subjects referring to which in the discharge of my present duty it is a great satisfaction to me to know that I shall carry with me the unanimous concurrence of all Members in the House. For it must be matter of general congratulation that Her Majesty's relations with foreign Powers continue to be of a friendly character, and that satisfaction is not diminished when we remember that this state of affairs is the sequel and continuation of a long period of repose, during which Her Majesty's subjects have, to an almost unexampled degree, enjoyed the priceless blessings of peace. I think it will not be denied that the great Naval and Military Services are at this moment in a state of order and efficiency, which has not for many years, if it has ever, been surpassed or even equalled. I think also I may say for every Member of the House that we rejoice in the continuance of honourable and happy relations between this country and the Colonies, and the strengthening of the ties which bind them to the Mother Country. I cannot expect so large a measure of assent when I suggest that the other great Departments of the State are in an eminently satisfactory condition. I may, however, rely on the fact that there has been a singular lack of serious or detailed criticism of those Departments by the responsible Leaders of the Opposition, even in the stress and excitement of the General Election. No—it was not so much upon criticism of what present Ministers had performed that their opponents relied, as upon boundless promises of those still better things which they, as expectant successors, were prepared to carry out. I am precluded, by the conditions of the peculiar position in which I am speaking, from any analysis or comparison of those wonderful predictions. But I may, perhaps, remembering the multiplicity and variety of the promises that have been made by hon. Members opposite, be permitted to say that those sanguine prophets will be indeed fortunate if, at the end of the term of Office which they anticipate, be it short or long, they can point to a record equally successful, to the same freedom

*Mr. Barton*

from criticism and the same absence of disappointment on the score of broken pledges and promises which, as one of their humble supporters, I claim on behalf of Her Majesty's Government. But while I cannot enter upon this discussion, I can at least appeal to the Mover and Seconder of the Amendment as to the opinion, which they are so well qualified to form, as to the prospect of the realisation of all or any of those promises, on the strength of which so many victories were won. I appeal to the Seconder of the Amendment (Mr. Burt), who enjoys so large a measure of the respect and attention of this House, for his views on this subject. I remember that last Session, as a new Member, I had the pleasure of listening to his most clear and candid speech on the Eight Hours Bill for Miners, and that I gave my vote in unison with his arguments, which, resting on the principle of the protection of minorities, were to me unanswerable. I trust, therefore, that he will pardon me if I appeal to him with reference to those matters, which are regarded with an almost feverish interest by those classes which he so well and worthily represents, to tell the House what are the measures, for the sake of the speedy settlement of which he proposes to turn out Her Majesty's Government. I trust I may appeal, too, in a similar spirit to the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Asquith) who will move the Amendment with reference to a subject which to me and my constituents is a matter of the deepest interest. The hon. and learned Member has often asked for light as to the leading principles and features which are to be embodied and reconciled in that Home Rule measure, for which some, though not all of our opponents, propose the foremost place. If that light has been vouchsafed to him, may we not ask him to "lighten our darkness"? And if his prayer has not been answered, may we not appeal to him to join with us in asking those, who must have these matters clearly in their minds, to disclose even now, at the eleventh hour, to Parliament and to the country those matters which so deeply concern the interests of the Empire? It is very easy to laugh at

such requests as these, but I do ask, in all seriousness, whether it is for the benefit of Great Britain and Ireland that the many months of the Recess that must elapse before Parliament re-assembles should, for the purpose of this great argument, be wasted on hypothetical and, therefore, barren discussion? I feel that I must not pursue this subject further; but I may, at least, point out that even from a numerical point of view the lessons of this Election are not all on the side of the Mover and Seconder of this Amendment. I hope it is a matter upon which the Government may be fairly congratulated by all Members of this House that after its six years of administration it has received renewed expressions of confidence from the majority of the electors of Great Britain. While I should be the last to admit that an Irishman has less right to the value of his vote than any Englishman or Scotchman, I do say that the circumstance that Great Britain has declared its confidence in Her Majesty's Government has a serious bearing upon this Motion and Amendment; because it has been suggested—not from this side of the House, but from quarters closely associated with the Opposition—that the fact to which I have alluded throws a serious difficulty in the way of any effective legislation upon this great question. I feel sure I may be permitted, as it will not be a question of controversy, to quote a few words from a periodical, a new and successful periodical, which is conducted by one of the most distinguished Members of this House, and of whom I may be permitted to say, as a fellow-countryman, that he is one of the most picturesque writers among our leading journalists of to-day. In the *Sunday Sun*, on the 4th May, the writer, after contrasting the probability of a majority of a hundred with the possibility of a majority of thirty, used the following words, which I am inclined to adopt:—

"A majority of thirty would mean that the people of Great Britain were against Home Rule, and it is ridiculous to suppose that we can carry a measure against which the British majority is declared."

Lest it might be thought that I am mentioning a matter upon which there has been any serious disagreement, I

may, perhaps, be permitted to quote from the *Independent*, the organ of the extreme section of the Irish Nationalist Party after the Election, on 18th July, this singular sentence—

“He (the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition) has no more power to pass a measure granting Home Rule to Ireland than he has of establishing waterworks in the moon.”

For my own part, I cannot on this occasion do more than call attention to the fact that the great majority of the electors of Great Britain have declared against any measure of Home Rule whatever; that the minority in Ireland have also declared against it with renewed and increased emphasis at those great and representative Conventions lately held in Belfast and in Dublin—Conventions composed of all classes and creeds in Ireland, and Conventions which have, as I believe, left a deep impression on the minds and consciences of men of all Parties throughout the three Kingdoms. I am prevented from entering more fully into a subject of such tremendous interest to myself and to those whom I represent; but I may surely say this—that whatever attempts were at first made to ridicule or minimise the importance of those solemn protests, their sincerity and reality have received practical proof and confirmation from the increased Unionist majority at the elections which followed so closely upon them, and which at once changed the balance of the representation of Ulster on the Home Rule question. The Home Rule question, if it is to defeat this Motion, therefore stands thus—the majority of the voters of Great Britain have declared against the introduction of any such Bill; a powerful and determined minority of the voters in Ireland have declared that they will never submit to a Home Rule Parliament, if one be attempted; and we have these additional declarations from leading organs of both sections of the Nationalist Party that under the existing circumstances it is practically impossible to carry any such proposals through Parliament. I may say one more word with reference to Ireland, and I feel that what I say in this connection will meet with universal acceptance.

*Mr. Barton*

It is that we all rejoice at the social tranquillity and absence of crime which now prevail in that country. Upon the causes which have produced that I may not argue in my present position, although I hold my own opinion on that subject strongly and confidently. I may, however, give expression to the hope, though for myself it is hoping against hope, that whatever change of Government or of policy there may be, no principles or policy will be introduced which can in any degree, however remote, lead to the renewal of social strife or disorder in Ireland. There is one topic I will conclude with, and in this respect I have no fear of exciting Party feeling. I am sure that every Member of the House, whatever change of Party there may be, will desire that those useful influences, which are at work in Ireland as the result of the legislation of the present Government, should be permitted to continue and be further developed. I refer especially to the Education Bill, which I trust will open to the humblest classes of Ireland that career for which their natural gifts so eminently fit them. I refer also to the Land Purchase Act, which, in the opinion of many of us, tends, by increasing the number of occupying owners of land, to widen the basis of property and order, to remove the ancient motives to agrarian crime, and to encourage thrift and industry among the people. And last, but not least, I refer to those efforts, which I can claim have been successful, to develop the backward and afflicted parts of the country, and to bring them into easier and closer communication with the centres of commerce and of wealth. In this I feel sure everyone will agree with me. I sincerely thank the House for the forbearance with which it has listened to me. I feel that hon. Members will at least credit me with this—that I have exercised self-restraint, and have endeavoured to submit the question with due regard for the traditions of the House. And I feel sure that everyone will join with me in the hope that no change of policy will allow those influences to which I have referred, to cease, but, on the contrary, that they may meet their fulfilment and bear their fruit in the increased

prosperity and happiness of the people of Ireland. I beg to move, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, as followeth :—

'MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal Subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled, beg leave to thank Your Majesty for the most Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.'" — (*Mr. Barton.*)

\*(4.45.) MR. WILLIAM H. CROSS (Liverpool, West Derby) (who wore a Court dress) : I hope, on one ground at all events, that I may claim the indulgence of the House, rising, as I do, to second the Motion so ably made by my hon. and learned Friend. My claim is that in past Sessions of this House I have rarely intruded in the Debates; therefore I am, at all events, free from the reproach of having wasted the time of the House. Another reason is that, in seconding this Motion, I am confronted by one or two difficulties. The first is that tradition binds me to avoid controversial matter, and this at a time when the air is full of controversy, when we are fresh from a hotly-contested Election, when we are entering upon a bitter Party fight, and when we are looking forward in the next Session to a contest such as even the most experienced veteran in this House may not remember in his whole career. My second difficulty is this: Since I was invited to perform this duty a dismal thought has occurred to me. Recalling the names of my hon. Friends who in past years have discharged this duty, I remember the names of Mr. Milvain, Mr. Hermon-Hodge, Mr. Forrest Fulton, and Sir John Colomb. All these Gentlemen, who were, I believe, deservedly most popular in the House, are absent to-day. The thought that has occurred to me is this — that if these men, so popular and able, could not resist the fate that awaited them at the Election we have just passed through, surely the omen is unhappy for my learned Friend and myself. But on our behalf,

I say, may the gods avert the omen! On one ground, however, we may take courage, and it is this. My hon. and learned Friend represents that extraordinary accession of strength to the Unionist ranks in Ireland, that growing feeling which seems to have been the most striking feature of the whole Election; and I, for my own part, claim to be the Representative of a great mercantile and industrial community; and I do claim, on behalf of Liverpool, that her voice in the last Election was given with a decision and an emphasis second only to that wonderful demonstration the City of Birmingham has given. Therefore, so long as political issues remain as at present, my hon. and learned Friend and I take courage, and we hope that the omen may pass from us. If I may turn for one moment to the terms of Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, there is one paragraph which, at least, we shall all receive, on both sides of the House, with the most hearty welcome. I mean that which states that Parliament should not be asked to sit for the transaction of business this Session. I believe we are only here for a limited purpose, and that it is the unanimous wish of all Parties in the House that we should bring this present Session to a close, and arm ourselves during the Vacation for the great fight that is now before us. From that I pass to the third and concluding paragraph of the Speech, and we, at least, on this side of the House, will welcome that emphatic expression which sets, as it were, the official seal of Her Majesty's approval on the policy which our Government has initiated and adopted during the past six years, and which we, as their supporters, have enabled them to carry out. While endeavouring to avoid controversial matters, I cannot pass over this paragraph without referring to one or two points in which I think the legislation of the Government has emphatically been such as will meet with the approval even of its most determined opponents on the other side. There are, in my opinion, four measures which stand out in the Government record as measures of first-class importance. I would place first that Act which was passed in 1888, and which laid the foundation of the

policy of County Government in England and Wales. Here, again, we all regret that the author of the measure is not among us to-day. I express the unanimous feeling of this side when I express that regret, and I am sure his absence is personally regretted on the other side. What adds an even more bitter pang to the defeat of Mr. Ritchie is that he, who is the father of the London County Council, received the blow at the hand of a London constituency, one of his own children. I hope he will be again among us before long, but whether he is or not, his great work will survive, and he will have the proud distinction of being the author of that Act which has worked so smoothly, and worked a great Constitutional change in county government with so little friction, and with the assent of all classes of the community. I might mention also another leading point of the Government action — the reconstruction of our Navy, and no one will object to our paying an increased premium on our increased trade. Then we can all recognise the skill and success with which the Chancellor of the Exchequer effected the conversion of the National Debt. Lastly, I will mention the grant of free education to all the children in our National schools. There were those on this side who doubted the expediency of that, but there is no Member who failed to recognise the fair spirit which animated the Bill, the care taken to avoid injury to any of the interests concerned in the Bill, and the financial skill which enabled us to take that burden on our shoulders without raising a penny more of taxation. We are prepared to go on, as we are invited to do in the Speech, in the path of useful social legislation; but unfortunately there is more than one way before us, and when we come to decide which is the path of useful social legislation the controversy begins, the distinction of Parties is before us. On the other side we are told there must first of all be radical changes in the Constitution before anything can be done — that the Parliament of the United Kingdom is to be split into two or more Parliaments — that there must be an alteration of the franchise, and that Members must

be paid for their services. On the other hand, there are some who think that Home Rule must come first, and who will give no quarter on that subject. On this side we take a totally different view. We do not propose any Constitutional change. We propose to take the weapons that we find ready to our hands, and make such good use of them as we have done in the past. We are prepared to go on in Ireland with the great scheme of local self-government which is before us. I think we might at once make some progress with the reform of the Poor Law, and it might be done without any opposition from either side. Further, we might attempt some scheme of national insurance, and amend the Employers Liability Act, so as to give the working men greater security, and yet to be perfectly just to the employers. We shall have the question of labour before us when the Commissions on Railway Hours and Labour report to us. I hope those Reports will contain some recommendations for the peaceful settlement of labour disputes which will put an end to the costly warfare of strikes. I am conscious that the Commissions must report much sooner than is expected, or this Parliament must last longer than is expected if they are to be dealt with by the present Parliament. These are a few of the items in our programme which I point to as useful social legislation. That is the path I should be prepared to follow if we remained in Office, but I am afraid there is no prospect of that. We frankly recognise that the Queen's Speech is not on this occasion a practical programme Speech. I recognise that the electors have voted for a change, and the Government are prepared to accept cheerfully the verdict. I think I may say that they can look back on their record with pride, and if any Government can claim a record of useful and beneficent legislation it is the Government at whose last hours we have now arrived. There are some cases when the beaten party has, perhaps, more reason to be pleased at the result of the strife than the so-called victors. If I had to write the epitaph of the Government I should say it had performed its promises, and had not promised what it knew it could

*Mr. William H. Cross*

not perform. I recognise at once that the motive power of this Session must come from the other side, and we on this side have only a languid curiosity as to who is to strike the fatal blow, and what is the weapon he is going to use. We are told in the newspapers that the blow is to be struck by the hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith). That hon. and learned Member is distinguished by ability and eloquence, but his special characteristic during the past few years has been a thirst for knowledge, a spirit of inquiry, an anxiety as to details. If we can get any indication from the selection of that hon. and learned Gentleman, I think I can interpret it. If it had been the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) who had been chosen we should have known that Home Rule was relegated to a second, third, or even fourth place in the programme. Had either Leader of the Irish Parties been selected we should have known that it was in the foreground, and should have known something of the nature of the Home Rule about to be proposed. If it had been the hon. Member for Rossendale (Mr. Maden) we should have known accurately the character of the Home Rule Bill. We should have known that gas, water, and electricity were the leading features of it. The hon. and learned Member for East Fife has been selected. I believe that spirit of desire for knowledge still animates him, and I hope it will continue to do so. I believe his thirst for knowledge is shared by this side and by nearly all on that side, not even excluding the Front Opposition Bench. I wish the hon. and learned Gentleman good luck and a prosperous end to his inquiries. May he receive his answer to-day, and may it be such as will enlighten the constituencies as to what is about to happen. I thank the House for so courteously hearing me, and, in conclusion, second the Motion for an Address to the Crown in reply to the gracious Speech from the Throne.

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
"That, &c." [See page 89.]

\*(5.5.) MR. H. H. ASQUITH (Fife, E.): I rise, Sir, to move an Amendment to the proposed Address—namely,

to add at the end the following words:—

"That we feel it, however, to be our duty humbly to submit to Your Majesty that it is essential that Your Majesty's Government should possess the confidence of this House and of the Country, and respectfully to represent to Your Majesty that such confidence is not reposed in the present Advisers of Your Majesty."

I trust that I may, without undue presumption, venture to offer a word of congratulation to both the hon. Gentlemen who have just sat down on the skill and courage with which they have comported themselves in a novel and difficult situation. The Speech from the Throne on ordinary occasions provides the Mover and Seconder of the Address with a large variety of topics, and the Address itself is in the nature of a grace before meat, in which this House expresses in anticipation its gratitude for the legislative bounty of Her Majesty's Government. On the present occasion the cupboard is bare, and to these hon. Gentlemen has been entrusted the embarrassing task of formulating the thanks of the House for a perfectly empty table. I think they felt, as we all feel, that that, after all, is not the real business for which we are assembled here to-day. As my hon. and learned Friend who has just sat down, in the course of his obituary notices, pointed out, we are met to take part in the obsequies of a dead majority. Both the hon. Gentlemen came to bury Caesar, and we need not grudge them the licence of eulogy—of which my hon. and learned Friend has taken full advantage—and which is always permitted in an epitaph. My hon. and learned Friend has been good enough to seek to wring my withers in reference to some appeals I once made for further information as to some of the main provisions of the Home Rule scheme. Whether or not those appeals of mine were wise and well-founded, and whether or not and to what extent they have been responded to by those to whom they were addressed, are topics I fear of limited interest, with which, however, at the proper time and place, I shall be perfectly ready to deal. But I decline to be drawn into a discussion of them on the present occasion, for the simple and sufficient reason that they have no

more to do with the question whether Her Majesty's present Advisers have lost the confidence of the country than have the speculations of astronomers as to the composition of the planet Mars. The Amendment brings us face to face with the practical aspect of the situation. We think it would be a futile proceeding if at the beginning of the first Session of a new Parliament we were to approach the Throne, as the Government wish us to do, with a barren formula of unmeaning gratitude. I propose to relieve them from that position by adding at the end of the Address words which, at any rate, will give it significance and adequacy. My Amendment consists of two propositions—One of them is an expression of opinion; the other an assertion of fact. As a matter of opinion, it asks the House to say that in its judgment Her Majesty's Government ought to possess the confidence of this House and the country. As a matter of fact, it alleges that Her Majesty's present Advisers possess the confidence neither of the one nor the other. Now, Sir, the first proposition, I am certain, will not be seriously traversed in the course of this debate, because it is a Constitutional commonplace which all Parties in the State are prepared to accept. If, therefore, this Amendment is to be controverted and opposed, it must be upon the ground that it is not true to assert that, in point of fact, the present Government have lost the confidence of the House of Commons and of the country. No other topic is relevant to the issue which the Amendment raises. Now, what are the facts? They are very plain, and beyond the region of controversy. Six years ago the Party now in power obtained a majority at the polls and in this House. Thereby it was recognised as having received a mandate to govern Ireland, and to govern Great Britain also, upon what were called Unionist principles. The years passed and they had to go back to the country for a renewal of their trust. Never in our political history was a proceeding more deliberately planned or more carefully carried out. They selected the tribunal; they drew the issue; they fixed even the day upon which their trial was to take place. An adverse verdict was given. The

*Mr. H. H. Asquith*

majority of 1886 is gone. The mandate which you then received has been revoked by the same power that gave it. That being so, what cause can be shown why this House should not, as its first act, perform the duty freshly imposed upon it by the constituencies, and record and render effective the considered judgment of the country? In asking the House to take that step we are following with literal strictness the precedent set by the Conservative Party in 1841, and followed by the Liberal Party in 1859. I will venture to trouble the House with a few words from the speech made in 1859 by Mr. Disraeli, then Chancellor of the Exchequer and spokesman of the Government of that day, on a Motion similar to that which I am now asking the House to accept, and which was then introduced by the present Duke of Devonshire—

"It is of the highest importance," Mr. Disraeli said, "to the public interests that this question should be immediately decided, and I hope the House will be enabled to divide on it to-night"

—that was the first night of the debate—

"and thus settle at this momentous crisis which Party indeed possesses the confidence of Parliament. The decision," he went on to say, "ought not to be delayed for four-and-twenty hours."

That was the course which was then recommended; and if that was the principle of action laid down by such high authority in 1859, I confess I cannot see why there should be that anxiety, indications of which have been already manifested in the speeches of the two hon. Gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address, not to come to an immediate decision upon the only issue which this Amendment raises, and which the country wants to have decided, but to drag the debate out over a wide field of irrelevant matter—matter which may become relevant when you have performed the preliminary process of entrusting responsibility as well as power to those who now sit on this side of the House, but which at this stage of the proceedings has nothing whatever to do with the issue raised in this Debate. Now, Sir, what I want to know, and what I am

curious to learn is, upon what grounds—(Laughter)—if hon. Gentlemen will wait for a moment they will perceive that my curiosity is both legitimate and relevant—I am curious to learn upon what grounds they are going to allege that the verdict which the country has given at the polls ought not to be given effect to without delay by this House? I have searched, and searched in vain, for any intelligible proposition on which the argument upon the other side can be framed; but, so far as I have been able to find out anything in the matter, I judge that the validity of that verdict is to be impeached first of all by reference to the composition of the majority, and next by reference to the means through which it is suggested that that majority was obtained. As to the composition of the majority, what is the argument? It has been, I think, indicated in vague and general terms by my hon. and learned Friend who moved the Address. What is said, as I understand, is this—"True it is that you have an apparent numerical majority both at the polls and in the House of Commons; but when the composition of that majority comes to be analysed, you will find that if you subtract from it one of its constituent elements—namely, the votes of the Members for Ireland—the majority ceases to be a majority at all."

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): Hear, hear!

\*MR. ASQUITH: It seems that I have anticipated the argument of the hon. and gallant Gentleman. The proposition, therefore, as I understand it, is this—that although you have obtained a majority of the electors of the United Kingdom against the continuance in office and against the policy of the Government of the day, yet, if upon analysis you can prove that that majority would not exist if you were to take away from it the votes of a single member of the United Kingdom, the majority has no title to speak for the whole; and the House of Commons and Parliament is entitled to disregard and ignore it. If I am incorrect in attributing that argument to the hon. and gallant Gentleman or any Member of what is called the Unionist Party, it accords, at any rate,

with the words of so high an authority as the First Lord of the Treasury himself. I will venture to recall the right hon. Gentleman's attention to some remarkable words which he used in a speech at Glossop on the 14th July, when the result of the elections could be forecast with almost absolute accuracy. The right hon. Gentleman said—

"The House of Lords, with the people of this country behind it"—

"this country" means, as the context shows, England—

"is certainly in a position to see carried out Mr. Gladstone's own principles—namely, that each nationality should manage its own affairs as it likes, and if he"—

that is if my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian—

"should attempt to tyrannise, by means of the Irish brigade, over the declared will of the English constituencies, the House of Lords will have the duty imposed upon it, and will certainly have the courage to see that Mr. Gladstone's own principles are adequately carried out, so far as England and Scotland are concerned."

What does the right hon. Gentleman mean? It is not disputed, as I have said, that we have a majority of the whole of the electors of the United Kingdom. It is not disputed that in three of the four component parts of the United Kingdom—namely, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales—we have a majority also. But, says the right hon. Gentleman, in effect, "Notwithstanding that majority of yours, I am entitled, speaking in the name of the people of England who have cast their votes the other way, to claim to ignore and override the opinion of the mass of the people of the United Kingdom, or even, if need be, to summon to my aid that pliable instrument which the Constitution has placed at my disposal, for the purpose of making the will of the English minority prevail." I protest in the name of sound Constitutional principle against this disintegrating and anarchical doctrine. I protest in the name of the unity of this still United Kingdom against this fantastic development of an abstract Separatist logic. So long as we have an Imperial Parliament, and so long as in that Imperial Parliament, as I trust and believe will always be the case, every part of the United Kingdom is represented, so long the Government



and the policy of the Government must be determined by the vote of the majority. Yes, by the vote of the majority; and by the vote of the majority I mean a majority of the whole. Under the right hon. Gentleman's theory England is to have all the advantages of the most extreme form of Home Rule without any of the counterbalancing checks and safeguards of Imperial control. If it is true to say that the majority depends on the Irish vote, it is equally true to say that it depends upon the Scotch and Welsh vote. If you subtract from the total majority the votes contributed by Scotland and Wales we are in a minority. Is the right hon. Gentleman going to apply his principle to that extent? May I paraphrase his language and say—"If he"—that is if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian—"should attempt to tyrannise by means of the Scotch and Welsh brigade over the declared will of the English constituencies, the House of Lords will have the duty imposed upon it, and will certainly have the courage to see that Mr. Gladstone's own principles are adequately carried out?" If not, why not? If your doctrine is good that the majority can be analysed into a majority contributed by Ireland, surely it must be equally good when it is analysed into a majority contributed by Scotland and Wales. I go further, and say it must be equally good when it can be analysed into a majority contributed by England. But the matter does not rest there. What is the real state of the case? At the General Election which has just taken place it is in Ireland, and in Ireland alone, that the Unionist Party have won seats. They have actually added five seats to their Irish representation. The majority at the time of the Dissolution was sixty-six. Having gained five seats, which count ten votes on a Division, the majority would, other things remaining the same, have risen to seventy-six. What has become of the majority of seventy-six? How has it been got rid of? Who has dug its grave? The answer is, the people of Great Britain. If the matter had rested with Ireland, English and Scotch and Welsh opinion remaining as it was, instead of your majority having disappeared it

would positively have been increased by ten. There has been a transfer of fifty-two seats in England, four seats in Scotland, and two seats in Wales. In other words, in Great Britain there has been a shifting from one side to the other of no less than fifty-eight seats. It is for that reason, and for that reason alone, that Her Majesty's present Government find themselves in a minority. I venture, then, before I leave this part of the subject—summing up what I have said—to assert these three propositions: I say, in the first place, it is no more true to say of the present majority that it is contributed by Irish votes, than to say it is contributed by Scotch and Welsh votes; I say, in the second place, that the dominating factor in the whole situation is the shifting of English and Scotch opinion; and I say, in the third place, upon the principles of true Unionism, which hon. Members opposite profess, but which they seem very slow in crucial cases to put in practice, when you are considering upon what lines the government and the policy of the Kingdom as a whole should be conducted, you are bound to look to the majority of the whole of the electorate and to nothing else. I now pass from that, to say one or two words, and they shall be very brief, upon the other argument, the only other argument, so far as I am aware, by which it is sought to impeach the authority of the verdict of the country. It is said that the verdict has been obtained by illegitimate means. Well, we are all familiar with the ingenuity of disappointed politicians in the art of explaining away majorities. It reminds one of another figure one often meets with in a different walk of life. I mean the figure of the defeated litigant. When the verdict has gone against him, he goes about whining amongst his friends, complaining that the witnesses gave false evidence, that the jury were packed, that the advocate upon the other side made the most shocking appeals to passion and prejudice; and he forgets that which in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred is the only real explanation of what happened, that he had a bad case, and was beaten upon the merits. Well, it is said that there were several issues in the Election, and

*Mr. H. H. Asquith*

that the opinion of different constituencies was determined by reference to different considerations. That is true in greater or less degree of all elections, but I assert that never in our Constitutional experience has there been a case where there was a large and general issue more plainly defined by both Parties in the State, and never was there a case in which the meaning of the verdict of the country as it has been recorded was more free from ambiguity or from possible mistake. That proposition does not, apparently, commend itself to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I therefore state the ground upon which I put it forward. I allege—and I speak subject to contradiction—that in every election address of every Unionist candidate, in every speech upon every Unionist platform, the issue submitted to the electors of the country was this—that the experiment of governing Ireland on Unionist principles had been proved to be a conspicuous and fruitful success. Is that denied? Was not that the ground on which every apologist and advocate of the Government, from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain) on this side of the House, and the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury on the other side, down to the humblest Member of the rank and file, appealed for the confidence of the electors? I am not going to argue the merits of that policy. *Causa finita est; Roma locuta est.* But I think it most relevant to recall the House to the point that, at any rate, the experiment was tried for a length of time, and under conditions which make it impossible for you to allege that the country did not thoroughly understand and appreciate it. The verdict of the country was directly invoked upon it, and it is not for you now to say that that verdict, under those circumstances, does not mean what it professed to mean. I say that the experiment was tried under the most favourable conditions. For six years you have practically had a free hand from the Imperial Parliament. Those Members who sit on this side of the House will acknowledge that in the then Chief Secretary, and now the First Lord of the Treasury, Her Majesty's

Government was fortunate in finding the very instrument they required. We thought his policy was a bad one, a barren one, and a hopeless one; but we recognise that they had in him a man who, by his tenacity of purpose and mastery of Parliamentary arts, did everything for that policy which statesmanship could do. The right hon. Gentleman was supported as no Minister has ever been supported in this House. He could always rely upon the unswerving loyalty of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and in certain quarters of this side of the House upon a perverted fidelity, which, I venture to think, is rare even in the annals of political apostacy. At the most critical moment, too, in the right hon. Gentleman's policy, when he was on the eve of imminent and certain failure, he was rescued by the great catastrophe, which for a moment split the Irish Party, and for a few short months staggered and almost paralyzed the energies of the Nationalist movement. Never, Sir, has an experiment in government been tried with such a concurrence of accidental and deliberate conditions in its favour. That is the policy which was put before the country for approval or disapproval. The electors voted with their eyes open, with their minds formed, with their judgment unclouded, and what has been the result? In England, Scotland, and Wales you have lost, as compared with 1886, no less than eighty-two seats; in Ireland you have won five seats—three of them by superhuman efforts, painfully, laboriously, and with difficulty, in the Province of Ulster—while of the remaining two, one was made a present to you by Nationalist divisions in the City of Dublin, and the other is a suburban constituency of Dublin in which Conservatism is a natural and growing force. But, Sir, outside the Province of Ulster, and outside the City and suburbs of Dublin, where can you show in the whole length and breadth of Ireland a freely elected Representative of the Irish people who is prepared to approve of your policy? The representation of Ireland remains substantially what it was. In the three great Provinces of Ireland where we have been told for months and for years that the people had been emancipated by the

right hon. Gentleman from the thralldom of agitators and Leagues, and were burning with the desire to show their gratitude to their benefactor and deliverer, in the whole of those Provinces, outside the City and County of Dublin, you have not been able to return a single Unionist Member to this House. Even in the very districts which the right hon. Gentleman has drenched with a golden shower of British beneficence—in Galway, in Sligo, and in Donegal—his nominees have cut the most sorry figure. I say, therefore, there can be no doubt, whether you look to Ireland, or to the change of opinion in Great Britain, that the constituencies of the United Kingdom have declared against your Irish policy. There is another aspect of the verdict of the country which it is impossible to ignore. It has condemned the Unionist policy in Ireland on the ground of failure and impotence; it has equally condemned Unionist legislation in Great Britain on the ground of imposture and pretence. The burden of the appeal made by Unionist candidates in Great Britain was always the same—"Who gave you free education? Who created the County Councils? Who passed the laws for Allotments and Small Holdings?" They did not know—they did not suspect—that the people of this country were shrewd enough to perceive that every one of those measures has two common characteristics. There is not one of them which was supported—there is hardly one that was not opposed—by the great bulk of the Unionist Party six years ago. There is not one of them which has not been carried into law in an incomplete and emasculated form. Sir, the Tory Party during the last six years has been engaged in abandoning the great historic position and compromising the traditions which, so long as they were maintained intact, always gave it a certain hold, not only over the respect of opponents, but over a great mass of deeply-rooted sentiment in the British nation. You have given up that position—you have gone in for a course of peddling and huckstering in what you call progressive legislation. You have done so in order that you might keep step with a small but dwindling band of deserters from the

Liberal camp, an accidental and ephemeral combination, which was born the day before yesterday, which will be forgotten the day after to-morrow. Sir, in 1886, ninety-four Dissident Liberals voted against the Second Reading of the Home Rule Bill. The same Party has come back from the polls to-day with a total numerical strength of forty-seven. If six years have sufficed to reduce a body of ninety-four to a body of forty-seven, it is not a very difficult sum in political arithmetic to calculate with some degree of accuracy the date of the ultimate extinction of the species. In deference to this transient and precarious alliance, the Tory Party have gone in for a course of legislative experiments which were too liberal for their own consciences, but not liberal enough for the people of Great Britain. The result is to be seen in the General Election. Surely it ought to open their eyes. To angle in other people's waters for votes and yet not to catch them, to poach through the whole of Parliament and in the end to take nothing, but to be taken yourselves, to palter with principle, to betray your pledges, to be false to your past, and then to find that the wages of ignominy is a minority, that is to be guilty of one of those blunders which in politics are worse than a crime. Depend upon it, the people of this country, if they want Liberal legislation, will go to the Party which believes in it, which is not afraid of it, which will give it in a complete and effective form. During these six years there has been in the sphere not of legislation but of opinion, a development and a ripening which has been almost beyond precedent. If we compare the state of things now with the state of things at the General Election of 1886 we are conscious in every direction of the stirrings of a new life. New wants, new aspirations, new ideals have forced themselves into being, and are winning their way to the front. They cannot be put down by repression; neither can they be put off by evasion and compromise. If this Parliament is to perform the great tasks which the country has imposed upon it, the Crown must be served by Ministers whom the people can trust.

*Mr. H. H. Asquith*

They have commissioned us to declare that from Her Majesty's present Advisers they have withdrawn their confidence. It now rests with this House to execute the judgment which the nation has pronounced. I beg to move to add at the end of the proposed Address the following words:—

"That we feel it, however, to be our duty humbly to submit to Your Majesty that it is essential that Your Majesty's Government should possess the confidence of this House and of the Country, and respectfully to represent to Your Majesty that such confidence is not reposed in the present Advisers of Your Majesty."

\*(5.46.) MR. T. BURT (Morpeth): I feel, Sir, that something almost in the nature of an apology is due from me for claiming the attention of the House so early in the new Parliament. I need not say to those who have been Members of the House of Commons for many years past that it has not been my habit to needlessly obtrude myself upon it. I am not an orator, as is my hon. and learned Friend who has just concluded his powerful speech. I am not even a talker. The occasions are few when I would not rather be silent than speak. I always speak with reluctance, and I feel on this occasion more than usual embarrassment and difficulty—not, Sir, that I have not full confidence in the justice and reasonableness of the Amendment that I have risen to second, but because it is exceedingly difficult to speak upon that Amendment without uttering something that is not commonplace and self-evident. I never could talk against time—I always have to imagine that there is some reality in the discussion in which I am engaged. By our Constitution and by usage it is essential that the Government should have the support of the country and the confidence of the majority of the Members of the House of Commons, and the present Government has not that confidence and that support. I do not think it is necessary for me to make an attack on the present Government. If the Government consisted of Members who possessed all the talents and graces; if it was the best Government that ever existed in this country, it yet lacks one thing, and that is vital—it has not a majority at its back.

Obsequies have been mentioned, and epitaphs. Well, Sir, there is a Latin maxim which I will not venture to quote, but which is generally rendered—"say nothing but what is good of the dead." Scholars, I am told, differ as to whether the rendering should not be—"Unless you can say something good of the dead, say nothing." Well, that narrows the theme, and the Speech from the Throne is not at all pregnant with suggestion. Well, Sir, I could say some good things of the present Government, but I do not think it is necessary; they will say those good things for themselves no doubt, and as my hon. and learned Friend has suggested—"We come to bury Cæsar, not to praise him." I have been endeavouring, as I generally do when I happen to find my friends in a somewhat questionable position, to seek the best motives I can to account for their situation. Certainly I do not believe that the present Government adhere to Office for any vulgar or sordid consideration—indeed, I believe they are influenced by patriotic motives—and the conclusion to which I have come is that it is their keenness, their passionate fervour as reformers and in favour of advanced legislation, that makes them inclined to stick to the Treasury Bench. The Government have introduced measures good so far as they go, but, as my hon. and learned Friend says, incomplete. I do not agree with those of my friends who say it is entirely immaterial who passes these measures if they only are carried. I have long held the opinion—and it has been confirmed by experience and observation—that it is of vital moment that Bills should be prepared and carried only by those who believe in them. That, I think, is high morality, and it certainly results in more genuine, real, honest, and complete legislation. We have lately had an appeal to the country, and we know what the result of that appeal is. There were many questions before the electors, but there was one question that dwarfed and dominated every other—the question of Home Rule or self-government for Ireland. I may have a word or two to say on that subject before I conclude, but this was not the only question before the electors.

There were many questions of social reform and questions relating to the industrial condition of the people which received a great deal of attention. I do not want to hold the present Government responsible, any more than we as a Party on this side should be held responsible, for all the election leaflets distributed during the recent contests, but strong claims were put forward on behalf of the present Government as being in a special and an eminent degree the friends of labour and of the working classes. Now I can speak with some feeling on that subject, because I received from time to time during the progress of the elections letters and telegrams stating that Tory candidates here and there quoted me as having declared that the present Conservative Government had been the truest friends of the miners and of working men. Knowing that I had time on my hands friends said, "Come along and help us. Come and contradict these statements, and help us to win the seat." Well, I knew that I had more than once committed some little indiscretions. I knew I had said a good word or two in support of the present Government. I knew I had made friendly reference to the Mines Regulation Act, but I had never used exactly the words attributed to me. Considering how seldom it is that Party politicians speak well of each other, and how seldom the Conservative Government have given me the opportunity of saying a friendly word for them, I thought it exceedingly hard that when I should say a word or two in this direction my words should be distorted. Now, what I did say in regard to the Mines Regulation Act passed by the present Government was that it was one of the best measures in the interest of miners that had ever been passed in the House of Commons. But each successive measure is, and should be, better than its predecessor. I said, too, that the present Home Secretary had taken great interest in the subject, and had given a great deal of attention to the construction of the Bill, and that he had endeavoured as far as he possibly could to make it effective in the direction of safety to the miners. But, Sir, I went on to point out that the Mines

Regulation Bill was not a Party measure, and that, as it was introduced by the present Government, it was line for line and word for word the Bill introduced by Mr. Childers, but which he was unable to pass on account of the defeat of the Liberal Government. I said, further, that all the important Amendments had been moved by the direct Representatives of the miners in the House of Commons by Members on this side of the House, that all of these had received the support of the Liberal Party, that, on the other hand, some of the Amendments moved, to which we attached importance, had been defeated by the Government, that the Bill with all its advantages was less complete, less perfect, than it would have been, on account of the refusal of the Government to accept some of our Amendments, and by the introduction of Amendments elsewhere, where the Government have a great deal more power than we possess. I find, too, that they claim to have passed a great number of other measures. There was the raising of the age for half-time children in factories, which was claimed as having been passed by the Government, and there was also the insertion of the fair wages clause in Government contracts. Now, as a matter of fact, the former of these, and indeed both of them, emanated from this side of the House, and on the raising of the age of half-timers the Government resisted and were defeated. The hon. and learned Gentleman who seconded the Address referred to the Employers' Liability Amendment Bill, and to the desire of the present Government to pass that Bill. I must say that they have not shown any extraordinary anxiety to pass that measure. For five Sessions that Bill has been mentioned in the Queen's Speech. No real honest attempt on the part of the Government has been made to pass it. The Second Reading was carried on one occasion; still, there was no effort to carry it through Committee. I have no doubt we shall be told it was because of the opposition of Mr. Broadhurst, myself, and other Members who represent the workmen; but there were many measures that we opposed which yet were carried by the Government, and therefore our opposition to that

*Mr. T. Burt*

Bill is a very insufficient reason for them to give. They have had a majority at their back not at all wanting in docility and obedience, and if they had been thoroughly in earnest and desired to pass their own measure, they were certainly in a position to carry it in any form they liked. There is also the amendment of the Conspiracy Law which my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Dundee brought before the House of Commons. This is an amendment to which trade unionists and the workmen of the country attach very great importance. The proposal was an exceedingly simple one. It was to enact that no combination should be in itself criminal unless the object it sought to accomplish was criminal, and it aimed at a better definition of the word intimidation. That Bill was defeated by the Government, and when in the present year the subject was brought forward as a Motion, it was objected to again, and an Amendment was carried to the effect that a Bill rather than a Resolution should have been presented to the House. The hon. and learned Member who moved the reply made a friendly appeal to me to state my opinion as to what are the questions which I thought the Government which succeeds the present Government would pass in the interests of labour and of the working classes. The Bills I have mentioned are some of the measures that I believe they will pass, and there are, no doubt, other matters of a very important kind—great social questions—the regulation of the drink traffic, for instance, a matter on which public opinion is very far in advance of House of Commons opinion in the direction of further limiting facilities for the sale of intoxicating drink. There are also great social evils in the country at the present time which must be remedied. We boast sometimes that we live in the richest country in the world, and then we hear people saying that the rich are becoming richer and the poor becoming poorer. I do not believe that that is so, but I rejoice to think that we are becoming less patient and tolerant of the extraordinary and unjust inequalities that exist between different classes of the community. Pro-

bably legislation cannot do much to remedy them. We remember Goldsmith said—

“How small of all that human hearts endure  
That part which laws and kings can cause  
or cure.”

But, however small the part may be that laws can cure, I think it is the duty of the Legislature to do what it can to grapple with these evils. With regard to the wealth of the country, I am not in favour of the doctrine of ransom, but I do think that those who derive large incomes from what we may call the natural resources of the country, which they had nothing to do either in creating or in improving, should contribute much more largely than they do at the present time to the taxation and to the rates of the country for the improvements that are so much needed. The hon. and learned Gentleman also invited my attention to the question of the hours of labour. On that subject I have repeatedly declared my views. I am strongly in favour of the shortest possible hours of labour. I have grave doubts as to the wisdom of Parliament interfering to limit the hours of adult men. At the same time, I would, as one of those who have doubts with regard to Parliamentary interference, appeal even to those who think with me on this and on other questions, not to be too pedantic, to recognise the fact that we may have to adopt new precedents, and that we may not be able to adhere absolutely to the old lines. I would also appeal to those who take an opposite view not to be unduly rash, to be considerate, to be thoughtful, remembering that they are dealing with very delicate, very intricate, and very complicated questions, and that a false step may be a fatal step. I am in favour of the utmost possible discussion upon these questions, and I think we ought to discuss them deliberately, calmly, and thoroughly. I am sure that in this House they always will be discussed temperately and fairly, and I hope that in the country also they will be discussed with calmness and thoroughness. With regard to the question of Home Rule, I would only say that, although prominent, it was not the only question at the recent Election. The decision of the country,

it seems to me, was a very emphatic one, and I think our fellow-subjects in Ireland are to be congratulated on the victory that has been won. Its opponents have done their best and their worst for six years to defeat Home Rule, and now, instead of being victors, they are the defeated party. They call us Separatists; they claim to be Unionists themselves. I am prepared to allow them to select their own designations. We are the true Unionists. We believe in a Union founded not on rifles and bayonets, but on goodwill and affection, and confidence between man and man and between nation and nation, and the time, Sir, has come when in this democratic country a Union on other foundation cannot continue to exist.

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Question, to add the words,—

"That we feel it, however, to be our duty humbly to submit to Your Majesty that it is essential that Your Majesty's Government should possess the confidence of this House and of the Country, and respectfully to represent to Your Majesty that such confidence is not reposed in the present Advisers of Your Majesty."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

\*(6.11.) THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. G. J. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): In one respect the opening of this Parliament, which, thanks to the defeat of the Home Rule Bill in 1886, once more meets in the full possession of all its traditional powers again to discharge its responsibilities to all parts of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland—in one respect I think we have had an auspicious opening, for a general feeling of good humour and courtesy has prevailed. May that be an omen that, in the fierce struggles which no doubt this Parliament will see in the course of its existence, we may continue to meet with the same courtesy which has been displayed in the opening speeches. The hon. Member for East Fife has been anxious to limit within the narrowest bounds the course of the Debate, but he has not even been able to prevail so far as to induce the Seconder of his Motion to conform with his impossible demand, and we have had the advantage of

hearing the hon. Member for Morpeth make some important declarations with regard to topics in which he and his constituents are interested. I venture to believe that in the course of this Debate we shall find that it will not be possible to observe that conspiracy of silence with which we were threatened in the Press by hon. Gentlemen opposite a short time ago. It would be most unnatural if the Leaders opposite were to think that the *morale* of their new recruits would be sustained if they were put under heavy fire without any permission to reply, and I think we shall see that this Debate will not lack animation before its close. There is another suggestion that I would make to hon. Members opposite. When we assemble in February a large number of them will probably be muzzled for some time, and I think, therefore, it would be both interesting to us, and it would be interesting to the country at large, that they should take this very proper opportunity of showing the general lines on which they intend to oppose the Party to which we here belong.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Hear, hear!

\*MR. GOSCHEN: The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby cheers that sentiment ironically, but we may, perhaps, in the course of this Debate hear some inconvenient remarks by the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond), and we shall see whether the right hon. Gentleman will be able again to retire during the dinner hour, or whether he will be compelled to listen to the appeals which, perhaps, once more may be addressed to him. The hon. Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) suggested that it was a most unnatural proceeding that we should not on this occasion be satisfied with a few hours' debate, and he seemed to think that when as great issues are to be debated as were ever submitted to any Parliament a few hours should suffice, and he quoted the instance of 1859 as a precedent. He rested his doctrine on the declaration by Mr. Disraeli that a decision should be given on that very night. But the hon. Member for East Fife did not continue the quotation and tell us the full force and meaning

*Mr. T. Burt*

of the appeal by the right hon. Gentleman. It was because at that moment there were foreign complications. War had just broken out, and it was all-important that it should be immediately decided who should be responsible for its conduct. And that is the solitary authority which the hon. Gentleman quotes for the proceeding which he so vaguely recommends. But, I would ask him, was the recommendation followed by the Liberal Party at that date? No, they debated the question for three nights. I make the hon. Gentleman a present of his precedent with the only further remark that, notwithstanding that it was in 1859 in the highest degree important that the decision should be rapidly arrived at, it was thought that the matter could not be disposed of in less than three days. But now the hon. Member suggests *Roma locuta est*, and there is nothing further to be said. We have not heard much from the right hon. Gentleman—because he wished to observe such very narrow limits with regard to Home Rule, and as to how far his ravenous curiosity had, or had not, been satisfied. But he could not maintain his own rule that the question of whether we possessed the confidence or not of the country was the only matter to be decided, and towards the close of his speech he ventured to touch upon several of the topics which he considered ought to occupy the legislative attention of the next Government. There is another point in connection with this matter upon which I wish to say something. There are Members in this House who count in the majority of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), and who have stated distinctly during the course of the Election that they do not, by any vote against the Government, intend to announce their confidence in our opponents, and that constitutes a special characteristic of the present case. The hon. Member for East Fife does not seem prepared to admit that there is any distinction between the case where a majority is homogeneous and where the majority is composed of different parts and different sections. Can we believe that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, when he comes into power, will be able

to secure at once the adhesion of the independent section of the Irish Party? I would ask him whether he will be able to secure the entire adhesion of the Labour Party? I am not sure whether in this Debate we shall hear some of the new Representatives of the Labour Party, whether the Member for Battersea (Mr. Burns) will be good enough to address us, or whether the Member for West Ham (Mr. Keir Hardie) will repeat in this place the declarations he has made elsewhere? There is another hon. Member whom we shall be delighted to hear if he will take part in this Debate, an hon. Member whom we shall all welcome within the precincts of this House, the hon. Member who sits now for South Longford (Mr. Blake), but who comes to us from over the water, and brings to this House the ripe experience and the eloquence by which he was distinguished in the Canadian Parliament. Whatever opinions he may hold I am sure that we are all glad to welcome him here. We feel a little jealous of the Eighty Club that the hon. Member honoured them with the first exposition of his views on Home Rule. But possibly he may see fit, in the course of this Debate, to give us the second chapter of his exposition, and he will possibly be able to show us whether the Canadian analogy, on which he was so strong, holds with regard to the fiscal policy which is to be imposed on Ireland, and whether the great success of the autonomy given to the Colony in the case of Canada would have been equally attained if Canada had not had its full fiscal liberty. The hon. Member seems to think that we must not discuss Home Rule in this Debate, but that it is simply a question of confidence in the Government. But we wish to know something with regard to the proposed Home Rule, and I doubt not that we shall hear something more of it during the course of this Debate. The hon. Member (Mr. Blake) spoke of the great difficulties that existed while the two Provinces of Canada, the one Protestant and the other Catholic, were united in a Legislative Union; and perhaps in the course of this Debate he will enlighten us as to how to draw a parallel with that case and with Ulster and the rest of Ireland united under one Parliament. I



think I have pointed out that there are several other interesting questions which may crop up; but the hon. Member for East Fife does not challenge us generally upon our policy; he only wishes to lay it down that we do not possess the confidence of the country. I may have a remark to make before I sit down with reference to the hon. Member's statement as to the composition of that majority. But before I pass to that point, the hon. Gentleman said that Home Rule had been the one paramount question which had been submitted to the constituencies during the Election, and he pointed to the election addresses in proof of that statement. I have waded through a vast number of electoral addresses, a large number of those of hon. Members opposite, and I deny entirely that Home Rule was given the most important place in those addresses. It had a place in nearly all of them; but it had a very subordinate place in a large number. The hon. Member says it was the main question which was submitted to the electors. I should like to know whether the supporters of the London Programme say it was the main question submitted to their constituencies? I wonder whether it was the broom that was to sweep away in London all the Unionists into a corner? Was that broom the broom of Home Rule or the broom of the London Programme? I leave the Radical Members for London to give an answer to that question. In Wales, I believe, Disestablishment counted for more than Home Rule; and as for the rural voters, I wonder whether hon. Members opposite really believe that the rural voter was mainly induced to give his vote for the Radicals in consequence of their language with regard to the noble aspirations of Ireland for autonomy or for justice to an oppressed people. I suspect that if they were to tell us the truth, it was the Mephistophelian whisper about the dear loaf which counted for more than all their oratory about Ireland. The hon. Member did not confine himself to saying that the Irish Home Rule Bill, or that Home Rule for Ireland, was the main question submitted to the constituencies. He said that the legislation of the

Government had been submitted to them as a test for judging the Government, and that we had been condemned on that test. Were we condemned on that test, or were we condemned on our Irish action? That is a point which it is very important to know. With regard to the future, hon. Members seem to think that they have nothing to do except to evict us from these Benches. What a view to take of it. They have nothing to do but to evict us, careless as to who is to be put into our places. (Opposition Cheers.) Hon. Members cheer too soon. The point I wanted to make is this. It is not the only important issue whether we should leave this Bench—it is far more important to know what is to be the policy—what are to be the views of the men who follow us. Is it simply a match between two cricket elevens, the main object being to get the other side out? Is it on that level that hon. Members below the gangway wish to leave the matter? We have a higher question to deal with than that. The real question is not only who are to take Office, but what their policy is to be. I wonder whether the Member for East Fife knows what the policy is to be with regard to Home Rule, which he says is the question which was submitted to the constituencies, but which we deny was submitted?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): Your policy.

\*MR. GOSCHEN: The right hon. Gentleman says our policy. I am speaking of the special policy which we believe you intend, if you come in, to substitute for ours. What is that policy?

MR. ASQUITH: If he will allow me, the statement I made is not the statement which the right hon. Gentleman attributes to me. The statement I made was this: You submitted to the country your Irish policy, and the country condemned that policy.

\*MR. GOSCHEN: Our policy condemned! The policy of the Government as regards Home Rule was not condemned, and he has no proof whatever that it was condemned. The majority has been achieved, as I have been attempting to show, not by the language of Home Rule, but it has been gained by..

*Mr. Goschen*

other language and other promises. The hon. Member rose too late. Home Rule was not the issue submitted in the chief degree to the constituencies; but even if it was so submitted the challenge was not accepted by hon. Members opposite, who tried to go off on other issues which have diminished the Unionist majority. The hon. Member for Fife said, at Leeds, in January, 1890—

"If they" (the Party opposite) "went to the country with a vague formula, calling it Home Rule or local self-government, or whatever they pleased, and obtained a majority on behalf of that formula, what would be the position when they went back to Westminster and introduced a Bill? The wisest and best scheme it might be, but the Opposition would tell them at once that was not the issue upon which the country had voted. 'You have,' they would say, 'no mandate for the introduction of that measure, and we are justified in obstructing it or mutilating it and forcing the Government to take it back to the constituencies.' And what was the Government to say to some of their own followers, who would say, 'Our electors sent us to support Home Rule, but this is not the kind of thing they intended us to support, and we shall go into a cave; or, as the Radical Unionists did in 1886, vote with the Opposition.'"

Is the hon. Member for East Fife going into a cave? I wonder if he will help the Opposition by voting with us. The right hon. Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) said that when he addressed his electors he would give the outlines of his scheme. He did not state the outlines; he restated the conditions of the problem; but was silent as to what solution he would give to that problem. Thus we stand in this position: that the issue—and we have the evidence of the hon. and learned Gentleman to confirm it—of Home Rule has not been before the country; and we, when in Opposition, shall be justified not only by the facts of the case, but by his authority, in treating that measure as if no mandate had been given. But the hon. Gentleman did not confine himself to Home Rule; he attacked the general policy which the Government had pursued, and scorned the measures we have passed as peddling and emasculated. He said we had emasculated those measures. He ran them down, and treated them in a very different spirit to that shown by the hon. Member who seconded the

Amendment (Mr. Burt), who gave more justice and credit to the Government, both for the intention and effect of the legislation it had passed. There is this difference between the Government which came into power in 1886 and that which preceded it: that we, at all events, have been able to pass those measures of which the hon. Gentleman himself, though he runs them down, cannot but say are large and satisfactory to the country. Our opponents, however, were unable to pass them. Why? Because they were always thinking of the machinery, while we were thinking of the work to be done. I commend that point to the country, as the one which will distinguish the two Parties in the future as in the past. Whenever they speak of their social measures, they say they must first democratise some institution or other before they can undertake them. In every case it is the same. They cannot undertake to deal with the Poor Law without first abolishing plural voting. They want to take the machinery to pieces before proceeding with the work. We believe that we are competent to deal with those questions of labour to which the hon. Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt) alluded, and whether we are in Office or out of Office we shall set ourselves to study them. We have studied those questions, and have passed a number of laws which, in your more temperate moments, you admit are well worthy of the Statute Book, and I repeat that whether in Office or out of Office we shall continue to study those problems which we know are closely connected with the rising needs of the country. The hon. Member spoke of the composition of the majority. He objected to the view that if we should be defeated by a majority we should be entitled to say that it was a majority which was caused by the Irish vote. We do not complain of the verdict of the country; we do not question the propriety of bowing at once to the verdict of the country, including the Irish vote, but we do note, and we cannot do otherwise, that we have a majority in Great Britain. It is of the greatest importance, from this point of view, that on the question of Home Rule there are two parties—Great Britain on the one side and Ireland on the other. The majority

of the Representatives of Ireland, of Ireland itself, have pronounced in favour of repeal of the Union—have pronounced in favour of something which goes much further than repeal of the Union, but the majority of the Representatives of Great Britain have taken the other course; they have emphatically endorsed the view that separation between the Legislature of England, Scotland, and Ireland should not take place, and if effect is given to the Home Rule Bill it will be by the majority of Irish votes coercing the majority in Great Britain. That cannot be denied, and it is a most important element in this controversy. Let me point to another feature in this case. If now we are defeated with the assistance of the Irish votes, it is because Ireland is as fully represented in this House and is as much a part of this Legislature as England, Scotland, or Wales, or any part of the United Kingdom. But supposing you had passed Home Rule and retained, as you propose, the Irish Members in this Parliament, what then would be the position when you had to deal with a Vote of Confidence turning on the administration of the Imperial Parliament? You will have this position. The Irish Members are to be retained; that seems to be laid down. They are to be concerned in the domestic legislation of the Irish people, but also in the domestic legislation of Great Britain, although they have not the same interest as England and Scotland in that legislation. The majority in England and Scotland might be satisfied with their domestic legislation, but the Irish contingent is to have power then, as now, to upset the Government which deals with it. Is that a tolerable position, or one which can be maintained? Let me point out to the Members opposite that they owe us some gratitude—although I have my doubts as to whether they feel it—they owe us some gratitude that the catastrophe which would shock the loyal, the patriotic, and the Unionist sentiments of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife has not happened. I appeal to the hon. and learned Member, who has told us he desires the retention of the Members for Ireland in this House. The hon. Mem-

*Mr. Goschen*

ber for South Longford (Mr. Blake), who comes from Canada, laid down the other day that it would have been not only a mistake of a temporary character, but a matter of dangerous tendency, if the Irish Members had not been retained in Westminster. Who has prevented their exclusion? It is due to the Unionist Party. But for the Unionist Party those Benches would no longer be adorned by the Irish Members; but for the Unionist Party our Saxon Debates would be heavy and unrelieved by flashes of that Celtic vivacity, with which we, in past Parliaments, have become familiar. Ought you not to be grateful to us for this service? I think the Nonconformists ought also to be grateful to us for what we have been able to do. But for us the late Mr. Parnell would have been installed as Prime Minister of Ireland, and would have been totally independent of British public opinion. Those who are called Anti-Parnellites would have been Parnellites still, and the Nonconformist conscience would have been utterly powerless to effect any change. ("Oh, oh!") Yes, but it is so. You cannot deny it. But whatever the majority be to which I have alluded, they are satisfied, and glad that they will eject us from these Benches. Home Rule is the question which will have to be debated and dealt with next Session. You, the Irish Members, will compel right hon. Gentlemen, whether they will or not, to go on with, to go forward with, their Home Rule scheme. We shall not sit any longer on these Benches on the Speaker's right hand, but we shall continue the struggle when we sit on his left, there as here. The hon. and learned Member for East Fife spoke of a victory. A victory is not a final triumph, and a defeat is not the dispersion of our forces. We know what the function and the duty and the place of the Unionist Party will be in the coming Parliament. We shall have to be the rampart against which the march "through rapine to disintegration" will have to be made. We see fresh battalions mustering for the march, and the statesman who denounced that ill-omened march is now going to place himself, sword in hand, at their head. "The march through

rapine!" It is an ugly word, but it is the right hon. Gentleman's, not mine. The "Plan of Campaign" is, after all, but another form of the "No Rent Manifesto." I do not know that it makes much difference whether the rent is withheld altogether or whether it is paid into the wrong hands. The right hon. Gentleman is a great discoverer of euphemistic synonyms, and as he has called boycotting "exclusive dealing," so perhaps he may re-christen "rapine" by a prettier word. But the facts remain the same, though phrases and names may change. Hon. Members from Ireland have not recanted their agrarian past. They stick to what they have said with regard to the agrarian movement. They leave the recantation to the right hon. Gentleman and his supporters. They do not recant. But to what goal is this "march through rapine" to be? To "disintegration" said the right hon. Gentleman. That word "disintegration" was not a mere rhetorical expression or exclamation on the part of the right hon. Gentleman; it had been long in his mind. He had asked before whether any sensible or rational being at this time of day would suppose that we should make ourselves ridiculous in the sight of mankind by disintegrating the great and capital institutions of the country, and by crippling our power for bestowing benefits through legislation on the country to which we belong. Powerful words of the right hon. Gentleman. They sum up the Unionist cause. We are not going to disintegrate the great and capital institutions of the country for the purpose of making ourselves ridiculous in the face of mankind. We are not going to cripple our power of doing good through legislation to the country to which we belong. I earnestly trust that as during six years the Unionist Party has succeeded in avoiding that crime, and that ridiculous attitude, so we shall succeed in this Parliament which has assembled to-day; and that it will be written in the annals of the country by future historians, when many of us have passed away, that to the Unionist Party it was due, under Providence, that Parliament after Parliament may meet once more in this, our Palace of Westminster, not crippled in its power

of doing good through legislation, but in the undiminished enjoyment of all its traditional functions, and bearing and discharging its responsibilities in full measure for the prosperity, and the happiness, and the honour, and the good fame of Great Britain and of Ireland alike.

\*(6.49.) Mr. JUSTIN MCCARTHY (Longford, N.): I have heard with some disappointment the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer; for the "fighting politician" was not in his usual fighting trim. A great part of the speech was made up of invitations offered to several Members of the House to take part in the Debate, and perhaps I ought not to speak, for among those invitations my name was not included, I have followed the right hon. Gentleman's (Mr. Goschen's) speech very closely, but I cannot find from first to last any explanation of the performance through which we are passing to-night. He did not tell us anything as to why this Debate should proceed, nor did he state the purpose the Government have in holding their seats to the very last. At one time I thought he was going to explain that they really had yet some wise and beneficent legislation which they would openly display to our gaze if we only gave them time. At first I thought that he was going to make some bid for a renewal of Office; but I heard no promise of legislation, nor any reason why they should hold as they do their present places in this House. Even during the right hon. Gentleman's speech there occurred to me a story I heard long ago as to a famous highwayman. After a long career of evil-doing this highwayman was captured. His only weapon, a favourite blunderbuss, was taken away from him, and he was about to be carried off to prison, when he made one last appeal to his captors. He asked that he might be allowed to fire one shot even with blank cartridge from the old blunderbuss. It appears to me that that is about the kind of performance Her Majesty's Ministers desire to go through during the next night or two. The right hon. Gentleman was very strong and severe in his analysis of the majority; he was very careful to discriminate between the Irish vote and the English vote. But the Irish vote before this time has

put a Government into possession of Office; before this time it has put a Tory Government into Office. Did we hear any decomposing of the majority at that time? Did the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues express any scruples about the Irish vote when that vote put them into power? Oh, no! The Irish vote was then welcome. It was a vote of the most charming character, and those who gave it were the best of patriots, because they put the right hon. Gentleman and his friends into power. The late Lord Palmerston, at a crisis in his foreign policy, was charged with having first supported a rebellion in China, and then with having suppressed it. To that charge he replied—

“Well, if we lifted them up at first and put them down afterwards, that, at all events, shows our perfect impartiality.”

We propose to show the same sort of impartiality on this occasion. We can say that it was our vote that put the Tory Government into power, and we are proud to be able to know that our vote will do something to put them out of power and out of pain. We, at all events, are clear in our condemnation of the Tory Government. What was their policy? All through their years of Office, despite their unrivalled chances and support, their policy may be summed up in one phrase—the policy of Coercion. What else did they do? They passed in an imperfect way some measures whose origin does not belong to them; but their only original policy was that of perpetual coercion. We know that some of them, at least, have professed sympathy with Home Rule, but now no words are too strong in condemnation and denunciation of any possible principle of Home Rule. Let me say that I, as an Irish Member, am more concerned in questions affecting my own country than in others, and that the mission of my friends and myself in this House is to secure the carrying of certain measures for Ireland. I say frankly that years ago I should not have cared in the least if the Tories had been the means of carrying a great measure of Home Rule for Ireland. We should have welcomed it from any set of Ministers; but we have lost faith in the possibility of a Party such as yours,

*Mr. Justin McCarthy*

depending as it does for power on certain offices in Birmingham, to give us an acceptable measure of Home Rule. But I do say that I want to be certain, so far as I possibly can be, with regard to the future. I want to be well assured—and I hope before long that I shall be well assured—as to what is to be done with regard to those questions by the Party which is now destined to succeed you in Office. For instance, take that measure for which we struggle—a measure of Home Rule. I suppose that when a Home Rule Bill is being brought in, the Home Rule Bill will be explained. If, when that Bill is brought in, it does not prove acceptable to the Irish people, there will be an end to that Home Rule Bill. Most assuredly the Irish people and those who represent them will accept no Home Rule measure from any Ministry which is not acceptable to Ireland. But suppose that measure is brought in and is acceptable, I want to be assured of this—that the measure will be pressed forward with as much energy and as much force as the incoming Government can wield. If the measure should, as it may, be thrown out by the House of Lords, I want to be assured that the energy of the Liberal Party will be as much pledged as ever to go on with that measure, to lose no reasonable chance of pressing it forward, and to keep it thus in the front of Liberal legislation until it is passed triumphantly into law. I think that is not an unreasonable demand to make on behalf of my friends before this House goes to a Division upon the present question. Then there is another subject of most vital importance and interest to the Irish Party, and that is the Land Question and the question of the evicted tenants—those tenants of whom so many are now homeless, and would have been helpless but for the aid given to them by that Party to which I belong. I want to know whether it is not possible and right that some inquiry should be made during the coming months into the condition of these evicted tenants, and the result of the investigation, in one form or another, submitted to Parliament during the coming Session? Then, again, we have the question of Coercion—the perpetual Coercion Act

introduced by the present Government. I should also like to ask whether it is not possible to suspend the application of that most odious measure until its final removal from the Statute Book? We should like to have some encouraging assurance on that subject. Then the whole question of administration is one of intense importance in Ireland. During the period intervening between this time and the carrying of a Home Rule Bill we should like to see, and we maintain we should see, the administration carried out in that spirit which is itself a justification and vindication of the principle of Home Rule. In this country the expression of public opinion has everything to do with administration. In our country, under a Tory Government, it has little or nothing to do with it. We think we may fairly claim from a Liberal Government, when they come into Office, and from the Liberal Party, that in the administration of Ireland some due and proper account should be taken of popular opinion and popular feeling. There is another question of great interest to the Irish people. There are some men still confined in prison of whom I should like to say a few words. One of these men those who understand his case believe to have been unjustly condemned. I believe the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary himself was so impressed by the case of Egan that he promised some inquiry into the whole conditions of the case. Either he never made that inquiry, or, so far as I know, there has been no result. And then, as regards the other men imprisoned, I think we might fairly say that although some of the crimes they committed were entirely abominable beyond the palliation of any national or Christian man, yet many were committed under conditions of fearful excitement and despair, and in some cases it is believed that police temptation led to crime. At all events, it is thought that as so long a time has passed, and as a better state of things has come about, the opinion has arisen that the time has come when there might be something of kindly effort to shorten the punishment or to mitigate its pain. These are questions regarding which I shall be glad to have satis-

factory answers from the Liberal statesmen and from the Liberal Party. I do not care to prolong this Debate. If any counsel of mine would have been accepted by the First Lord of the Treasury, I would have advised him to act towards his colleagues as a French statesman did some thirty years ago. A great crisis, something like the present, had arisen, and the French statesman did not care to prolong a futile formality. So he called together his colleagues, and said: "Gentlemen, I have the honour and the regret to inform you that the country is sick of us all." I think it would have been wise and dignified if the right hon. Gentleman had frankly informed his colleagues, instead of leaving to us the task of forcing on them the information, that the country is sick of them all.

MR. G. WYNDHAM (Dover): It has been usual in this House for hon. Gentlemen to address it alternately from the right hand side and then from the left. I think most of those who have listened to the speech of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) who has just sat down will agree with me that it would be far more interesting were his speech followed by another speech from the same side of the House. It is impossible for anyone who supports the present Government to give any categorical answer to the categorical questions which he has addressed not to those who sit upon these Benches, but to those who occupy the Benches opposite. We have been curious, and we have looked to the hon. Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) as the personification of curiosity, expectant and unappeased. We had hoped this afternoon that he would have pressed his question and at last obtained some light upon the dark problems with which we are now face to face. But this mantle has fallen upon another's shoulders, and we welcome in the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down one even more worthy to bring us the light for which during the last six long years we have prayed. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has also, I think, done much to demolish the case of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for East Fife, who told us that such

curiosity as has been indulged in by the hon. Gentleman who preceded him was wholly irrelevant, and that the only question before the House was whether Her Majesty's Ministers enjoyed the confidence of the House and of the country. And he declared that the first proposition of his Motion, namely, that Her Majesty's Ministers should enjoy the confidence of the House and of the country, was of so much importance that we had only to glance upon it, together with this proposition—namely, that Her Majesty's Ministers did not enjoy that confidence—in order to support him. Sir, it is because I am convinced that the Government should enjoy not only the confidence of this House but of the country also, that I pause to investigate the second proposition contained in his Motion. That sets forth on the face of it that Her Majesty's Ministers have forfeited the confidence of this House and of the country. But, Sir, it is not in our power, so to speak, to isolate the deeds or misdeeds of this Government, and review them either with complacency or regret. There are only two alternatives before us, and when there are only two alternatives, if you reject one you must accept the other. Since Party system of Government has prevailed in this country, it is impossible for us, even if we think Lord Salisbury's Administration has fallen short of ideal success, to pass a Vote of Want of Confidence in Lord Salisbury without passing a Vote of Confidence in the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has pressed home questions which we hope to hear answered to-morrow, or on Thursday. Our task is a difficult one. It consists in analysing the result of the General Election, and to see whether we can truly be said to carry out the mandate we have received if we put the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) into power. Now, my hon. and learned Friend the Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) seemed to think that this was a very easy matter indeed, and that it was in the knowledge of us all that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian commanded the confidence of the country. But what information

have we had? After Thursday night we shall know whether he commands the confidence of this House; but beyond the fact that the lists of Members who have been returned to this House, which have appeared in the daily papers—beyond the fact that in those lists a "G" has been appended to a large number of names, and that that symbol is supposed to indicate that the constituents who returned such Members are in favour of the experiment of Home Rule, we have no knowledge whatever that the Administration of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian would command the confidence of the country. That majority of Gentlemen whose names have appeared in the Press with either a "G." or a "G.L." appended depend—and this cannot be denied—largely upon hon. Gentlemen returned from Ireland, and largely upon hon. Gentlemen who, whether they called themselves Labour candidates or not, have been returned to this House by the Labour vote—candidates who have been returned to this House by the industrial population of this country, which now demands that the attention of Parliament shall be turned to their affairs. Moreover, Sir, I ask whether it can be said that right hon. Gentlemen opposite who claim a majority enjoy the confidence of the country? Can they be said to have originated either of the policies supported by hon. Gentlemen from Ireland or supported by those who appear here to speak for the interest of labour? I believe that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian claims to have long had hidden within his breast the secret wherein, by some such compromise as he proposes, lay the ultimate solution of the Irish question; but I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) will lay claim to the like priority of invention. I think his conversion was due to a sudden cause, and I think the same remark applies to the bulk of those who support the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. If that is so they cannot claim to have originated or created the policy of Home Rule. The same applies to the demands now made by the industrial

*Mr. G. Wyndham*

classes of this country. With some of those demands we have endeavoured to deal during the last few years, but they were never, so far as I know, embodied in the Authorised Programme of the Liberal Party. On the contrary, they were flouted and set on one side and branded as belonging to the "Unauthorised Programme," and it is impossible for right hon. Gentlemen who will accept Office if this Vote is carried, to pretend that they originated the policy of Home Rule for Ireland, or that they originated any of the demands put forward by the constituents who have returned a very great number of English Members to this House. And if they have not originated them; if they are only proselytes—although we may admire the zeal which is often credited to proselytes—we can hardly condemn their new allies if they look upon them, not with confidence, but with some suspicion and distrust. I think, Sir, it will not be hard to show that the two great contingents of the army upon which they rely for success, so far from being recruited from electors who have confidence in the policy of right hon. Gentlemen opposite, are recruited from electors who during the last three weeks, at every public meeting, have shown the greatest suspicion and distrust. Let us consider whether we have any evidence that the Irish electors who have sent Members here to support a policy of Home Rule have confidence in right hon. Gentlemen opposite? Is it a proof of confidence that now, after six years, the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy) has had to ask some ten or fifteen questions, and tremble for the answer which will be vouchsafed? Is it a proof of confidence that the hon. Member for East Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor), a gentleman whom we all respect, and who is not given to the use of extravagant language—is it a proof of confidence in right hon. Gentlemen opposite that he has declared in public that the Irishman who trusts English Ministers is unfit for public life? We can hardly suppose that hon. Gentlemen coming from Ireland do not consider themselves fully qualified to sit in the places they occupy. But if they do consider themselves so qualified, then, according to the hon. Member for East Donegal, every one of

them is imbued with the deepest and profoundest mistrust of the right hon. Member for Midlothian and all his lieutenants upon the question of Home Rule. The same may be said with regard to those hon. Members who look to the industrial classes for support. I read in a pamphlet published some time ago in the interest of the Labour Party that the Liberal programme at the next Election would not be the Newcastle Programme, but only just as much as Mr. Gladstone could be forced to promise explicitly to carry out by the working classes threatening to vote against him. What a touching picture of confidence! How strange it is that there are these evidences of distrust in the very Members who are returned to give a majority to the right hon. Gentleman opposite! An attempt is being made to seize upon the great power and authority of those men who originated these policies in order to lend emphasis to and to back the movements which right hon. Gentlemen have condemned in the past, and movements which they now view not unmixed with thinly-veiled alarm. I think the stingiest-hearted Tory may be allowed to condole with those who have been in the past leaders of a Progressive Party. They are now to be the formal and pacific instruments of policies which they view without enthusiasm—the Mace and Great Seal, so to speak, to acts they do not in their hearts believe to be for the benefit of their country. Their case is only comparable to that of the King of Uganda, who, as we understand from the Press, is alternately the coveted prize and the captured trophy of the Protestant or Roman Catholic section in his country. So the task before us is by no means so easy as the hon. Member for East Fife would lead us to believe. We are asked to focus two divergent views in the United Kingdom into a concise Motion which will command the assent of this House. And these views, Sir, have been very divergent. I admit that with faltering accents the country has revoked the commission given to the Unionist Government, but it has, I maintain, with also unmistakable emphasis rejected and repudiated the policy to which the right hon.



Gentleman opposite has been pledged. I think this will hardly be disputed so far as it relates to the great towns and centres of industry in Great Britain. In Ireland the same feeling may also be traced. There there are two great cities, each the centre of large industries—the Cities of Belfast and of Dublin. The City of Belfast has declared with a unanimous voice against any attempt to carry Home Rule—against all possible forms of that policy, and the City of Dublin has partly declared against any form of that policy, and partly against the special brand of that article which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian is prepared to supply. If I wish to seek for further evidence I could find it in the journals which share the views of hon. Gentlemen opposite. During the distressful days—the anxious days—of the last General Election—Sir, it is in the moment of dire extremity the truth will out—it was when the issue was just trembling in the balance, and when the rule of three, in which some right hon. Gentlemen opposite took so much delight, pointed to a dead heat as the result of the conflict—it was then the *Pall Mall Gazette* published a leading article pointing out that their victories had been one where they put forward a Progressive programme. Yes, Sir, but you cannot push—as the *Pall Mall Gazette* had it—a programme into a foremost place without dislodging the programme which already stands there, and it is because in those places they supplanted and dislodged the orthodox Liberal programme that in London and other places we suffered a falling-off, and are, therefore, not in a majority in the whole of the United Kingdom. In these places, the defection of which has put the Unionist Party in a minority, the orthodox programme of Home Rule for Ireland, and Disestablishment for Scotland and Wales, has been displaced, and for it has been substituted promises that the needs of the industrial classes will receive the attention of the Imperial Parliament. But, Sir, what a light does this throw upon the Motion of the hon. and learned Gentleman, for he asks us nothing more nor less than within three weeks of this verdict to reverse

it in the House of Commons. The country has pronounced in most unmistakable terms that it insists upon Parliament turning its attention to practical legislation. Yet we are asked now, in the face of that, to return to power right hon. Gentlemen pledged to defer the attention of Parliament altogether from such affairs, and occupy the whole of its time with questions which will interest Irishmen, Scotchmen, and Welshmen, but which will be absolutely indifferent to the working classes of England. I can quite understand that my remarks will not be palatable to hon. Gentlemen who represent Irish constituencies, or Scotch constituencies, or Welsh constituencies—but they are not addressed to them. They have had explicit orders. And a large majority of English Members have had orders equally explicit in the contrary sense. But a far larger majority than that, pledged specifically to support the Unionist Government during the last Election, has been returned to Parliament with a direct mandate from the people that the attention of Parliament shall be turned to their affairs, and the question before this House is not the simple one the hon. and learned Member supposes. It is not whether we are to get rid of Ministers who have fallen short of ideal success, but whether we are to get rid of English affairs altogether. The question is not merely whether we are to get out of the frying-pan, but whether we are to get into the fire. We are confronted with a grave danger—the danger of seeing all the pledges we have given to our constituents broken through no fault of our own. We are confronted with the danger of seeing the beneficent legislation referred to in the last paragraph of the Queen's Speech suspended *sine die* to a period when these impossible problems shall have been solved. I challenge any hon. Member sitting upon either side of the House, who have been addressing industrial audiences during the last few weeks, to say whether their hearts' desire is not set upon securing immediate attention in the Imperial Parliament to those questions which affect their happiness and life. No one can take up that challenge; yet we are asked by the hon. and learned Gentle-

Mr. G. Wyndham

man who has made this Motion to betray our trust and to go off in pursuit of some will-o'-the-wisp which will only lead us into endless trouble. This policy of Home Rule, even if we had never heard of it before, is one which we may judge of as being impossible by the list of questions which have been addressed this afternoon to the Leader of the Opposition, by the Leader of the strongest wing of the Irish Party. We know that this policy is one which must take years to go through, even if it could possibly be passed into law, and that, if attempted, it would prevent the consideration of matters which are far dearer to the masses of the people than Home Rule. And yet we cannot hope that these considerations will have any weight with right hon. Gentlemen opposite. It is impossible to deny that they have given pledges to consider and to deal with that question. It is idle to pretend that these pledges will not be exacted, since the majority depends not upon the English vote, but upon the Irish vote. Many of us, I believe, are not fully aware of the enormous difficulties which necessarily attend the policy of Home Rule. As has been said by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the lines of the Home Rule policy have never been announced. We have never been vouchsafed sufficient knowledge of the conditions which it is the purpose of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian to fulfil if he can. We know that he has made one attempt to fulfil the five great conditions which necessarily attach to the question, and that that attempt signally failed. I venture to say that if another attempt be made to do so failure must again be the result, and yet the House is asked, at the sacrifice of good solid work which the country requires and demands, to give all its energies to a question which will not be, and cannot be, satisfactorily settled so as to satisfy Irish aspirations. I know that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian has said that he has found hon. Gentlemen from Ireland of a disposition to interpret everything in the best sense; but such complacency and such good nature on their part is, perhaps, explicable by the

fact that they only received his last Bill *pro tanto*, reserving to themselves the right of reconsidering their position at any time. It is not at all surprising, therefore, to find in the Irish Members this complacent disposition to interpret everything in the best possible sense, for they know that afterwards they can turn back from their word and extort even further concessions. That may be a policy in the eyes of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, but it strikes many on this side of the House as a conundrum of the kind with which schoolboys seek to mystify one another, and that admits of no solution. And yet it is to waste our time upon this riddle which no man can read that we are asked to postpone altogether such legislation as this Government has passed into law, and such legislation as the Unionist Party would proceed with were it so fortunate as again to secure the confidence of the country, for they have had pledges from their Leaders, as distinct as the pledges from the Leaders of the hon. Gentlemen opposite have been ambiguous, that this Party, if again returned to power, would pursue a course of practical reform and domestic legislation for the benefit of the industrial classes in Great Britain. Finding that the task of Home Rule was a difficult one, hon. Gentlemen opposite have been forced back upon the old expedient of the Liberal Party in distress, and announce their intention to pass a new Reform Bill. The hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) has made an attack upon the Tory Party, and has said that the country is anxious to see the Liberals in Office, because they understand and can pass Liberal measures. But to what record can he point to justify such a statement? Where can he find a record of any legislation by the Liberal Party in the interests of the industrial classes of this country to compare with the long list of Statutes which have been placed by the Tory Government on the Statute Book as the law of this land? The question of Reform is one which is generally supposed to give our opponents an advantage over us. They point to their record in Reform. I have never been able to find, at any rate during the last

twenty-five years, any clear evidence that we have grudged political power to the industrial and labouring classes of England. I am aware that that opinion is not shared by hon. Gentlemen opposite, who tell us that it is they, and not we, who have shown unbounded confidence in the working classes of England. I am aware that some votes may have been won during the last General Election by the cry of "One man one vote," but the English working classes are beginning to see that without re-distribution that would not be fair or satisfactory.

(7.45.) M<sup>R</sup>. A. CAMERON CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston): The hon. and learned Gentleman who moved the Amendment did not forget to charge the Liberal Unionists, who are supporters of the present Government, with being deserters from the Liberal camp. While our opponents are attacking us, they do not attack us upon the ground that it is either wrong or foolish on our part to have convictions that Home Rule would be disastrous to Ireland and injurious to Great Britain. The attack which they constantly make upon us is that, holding those views which they know we hold, we give effect to these views, and are not deterred from doing so by any obligations of Party loyalty. If they are justified in charging us with want of Party allegiance under the circumstances, then it must follow that they themselves through Party loyalty would support Home Rule even if they believed it to be disastrous. If that is so—if their views of Party loyalty are of such a character, then we have no guarantee that they themselves are sincere in believing in Home Rule, or that they do not share our views as to its disastrous character. It seems to me that one of the great evils of the Home Rule policy which we are asked on this occasion to support is that it would lead to our United Kingdom for the first time using the forces of the United Kingdom to put down those who resist laws which the people of the United Kingdom had never sanctioned; because, whatever discussion has taken place upon this controversy upon one side or the other, it has always been taken for granted that the measures which a Home Rule Parliament would

pass would be different from the measures which the Imperial Parliament would sanction. Amongst the various arguments which were used during the recent Election few arguments struck me as being more startling with regard to the disadvantages under which the Irish people laboured at the hands of the Imperial Parliament than the declaration made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) that the Irish people are oppressed by unequal laws devised to place them under their landlords. That is a very striking indictment against the landlords of Ireland, and a very striking indictment against the motives which led to the passing of these Land Laws. That indictment becomes the more striking when we remember that the author of these laws was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian himself, and that if any man was responsible for the Land Laws of Ireland, for the whole outline of their policy, it was the right hon. Gentleman himself, who not only charges these landlords as being bad, but attacks the motives for passing these laws by stating that they were designed to place the Irish people under their landlords. I do trust that whatever the effect of this discussion may be, it may elicit from our opponents further information as to the policy which they intend to pursue, and that it may be no longer possible for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian and his friends to maintain that policy of silence and secrecy which is alien to all the best traditions of his own Party and all other Parties in this House.

\*(7.50.) CAPTAIN H. S. NAYLOR-LEYLAND (Colchester): The hon. Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith), in the course of the speech in which he moved the Amendment, quoted the words of Mr. Disraeli in 1859. He said Mr. Disraeli advocated that the Amendment then moved was of such importance that the Debate upon it ought to be terminated in one evening. If the hon. Member for East Fife had taken the trouble to still further prosecute his historical studies he might have found out what was the sequel in that case. The Amendment was carried, and then the Government which followed brought in and passed a Reform

*Mr. G. Wyndham*

Bill in 1863 and were then turned out of power. I do not know whether the hon. Member for East Fife will take that as an omen; if so, I conclude next year the Home Rule Bill will be brought forward and the same result will follow as in the case I have mentioned. The present Government has been stigmatised as a Government of Coercion; but I imagine a good deal depends upon what you call Coercion. Some people might call Coercion the force which induces people to give deference to an equitable law. Others might call Coercion the pressure administered not by judicial officers, but by ecclesiastical domination which leads tenants not to put their rent into the hands of the landlords to whom it is due, but into the coffers of the Plan of Campaign. Then, again, if the present Government, can be called a Coercion Government I should like to ask the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy) whether he calls the Government which held the reins of power from the year 1880 to 1885 a Government of non-Coercion? It would be interesting to know his opinion upon that Government. Of course, the laudable desire of hon. Members opposite to give effect to certain pledges and promises and to carry out a certain policy and a certain programme must not be confounded with a desire to eject the present Government from Office. What they desire is that their pledges and promises given during the late Election shall be given effect to. But what are their pledges and what are their promises? What is their policy? I imagine here we are in a singularly fortunate position. We know what our policy is—do hon. Members opposite know what their policy is? If so, why do they not tell us? Why do not the Mover and Seconder of the Amendment and those who have spoken in support of it say that to effect certain things they have been returned to this Assembly, and that in the absence of any signs of the Government of the day intending to proceed with them they move a Vote of Want of Confidence on the understanding that if it is carried they would immediately proceed with them? Why do not hon. Members oppo-

site take up that position? That is a position which everyone could understand. Is it because of their inability to support the programme as adumbrated by certain gentlemen at Newcastle, or that they wish to include in it certain of the requirements of their own constituents? I think before we are asked to support such an Amendment as this we ought to be satisfied by certain pledges given by hon. Members on the opposite side that there is sufficient unanimity among them to pass any programme into law supposing they hold the reins of power and become the Government of the day. To obtain that unanimity it is absolutely necessary that the programme of the hon. Members opposite as a whole should be endorsed by every individual Member, and conversely that the programme of every individual Member should be endorsed by the Party as a whole. Now, do all the hon. Members opposite endorse the programme, for instance, of the hon. Member for West Ham? That programme includes adult suffrage, eight hours a day, open-air concerts, and baths and washhouses. Does every hon. Member who intends to support this Motion also pledge himself to provide us with free dramatic performances; does he also promise us that our ablutions in the future are to be carried out at the public expense? If not, I conclude the hon. Member for West Ham will not support this Motion. I am perfectly prepared to admit that the hon. Member for West Ham would be welcome on these Benches. At this dull season of the year an hon. Member, who is going to provide us with open-air concerts, with a morning bath and an evening wash, would be welcomed as a great acquisition; but it appears to me, in moving this Motion of Want of Confidence, hon. Members opposite ought to have assigned some reason for having done so. One of three reasons appears to be perfectly logical and reasonable. Hon. Members might have coupled with it a trenchant criticism of the programme of the present Government for the future. They might have coupled with it a condemnation of the performances of the Government in the past. They

might have produced an alternative programme, and said, if voted for, they would pass that programme into law at once. But neither one or other of these things has been done. If they had produced an alternative programme, I do not think it would have been just or fair to have asked hon. Members to have given us details of any Home Rule Bill. I do not think we ought to ask them to forecast the speeches which, perhaps, they may have to make on future occasions, but I think we have a right to have certain broad details and particular principles given us which would enable the Irish Members to determine whether such a Bill goes far enough for them, and which would enable English Members to determine whether it goes too far. Such principles might be mentioned as whether fiscal duties and fiscal barriers are going to be set up between Ireland and the United Kingdom, or between the manufacturer and the producer. We might be told whether religion is going to be protected by law, whether the basis of representation is going to be changed, or whether hon. Members are going to be returned to a new Irish Parliament in precisely the same way and on the same basis as now: whether it is going to involve the retention or the exclusion of the Irish Members from Westminster, and in what proportion they are going to come, and on what basis they are going to be elected. I think this is due to us, and it is only just that we should be told certain broad principles of the Bill which is going to be introduced. Furthermore, I consider we ought to be told the nature of some of the other measures which are to be introduced, and not only the nature but the order of their production. We have hon. Members in this House who represent all classes of the community whom I am rejoiced to see here. Some of those Members represent the interests of labour. Now, it would be most interesting to know whether in the future any measure is going to be introduced which will deal with that subject? Other Members represent certain portions of the community such as Wales. It would be interesting on their behalf to know whether a Bill is to be introduced for Welsh Disestablishment? Then there

is registration reform and re-distribution—are Bills to be introduced on these questions? All these subjects are subjects on which I submit we have a right to be informed, and a right to ask for an alternative policy to be produced. There is only one Bill which, as I understand, hon. Members opposite are thoroughly pledged to bring in at once. With regard to that, I can promise them that hon. Members on this side of the House are pledged when it is introduced to give it their most strenuous opposition. I mean the repeal of the Septennial Act. Well, hon. Members opposite might have assigned as a reason for introducing this Motion a criticism of the performances of the Government in the past; but I must point out that that criticism would only have been on two lines. Either they must have claimed for themselves that they could do what we were unable to do, or else they must prove that the basis of our legislation as a whole is entirely wrong. If that was the situation, then it would be necessary for hon. Members, if they carried this Motion, to repeal all that we have done. Are hon. Members prepared to repeal the Free Education Act? Are they prepared to repeal the Allotments Act? Are they prepared to say no more ships are to be added to the Navy? Another ground which might have been taken is that they might have criticised the performances of the Unionist programme of the future. I understand that the present Government does not intend to legislate for any one class or any one portion of the Empire, but for the future, as they have done in the past, to deal with every portion of the community. There is one great argument which the hon. Member for East Fife used in moving this Amendment, and that was that a precedent existed for doing it. I do not know whether it is the rule and the canon of this House that everything is to be done by precedent. If so, I take it we shall generally find ourselves doing only that which has been already done before. I will point out that it appears to me to be absolutely necessary to the point at issue to find out whether the precedent to be followed is good or bad. I take it we

*Captain H. S. Naylor-Leyland*

do not propose to follow bad precedents. Take, for instance, a judicial precedent. In a case where an appeal is given the decision depends entirely and absolutely upon the question of whether the original decision was good or bad. Therefore, I think this is absolutely vital to the contention of the hon. Member for East Fife. The hon. Member ought, no doubt, to have demonstrated that the surrounding circumstances of the case are the same now as they were in 1859, but they are not the same now as they were in 1859. I would remind the hon. Member for East Fife of the saying of a great writer that "great men create precedents and little men follow them." I have only got a few words to say in conclusion ("Go on.") With regard to the merits or demerits of the present Government we do bear on ourselves at this time the stamp and impress of our constituencies. More so now than a Parliament which has sat for several years. Therefore I submit that it is more our duty now than at any other time to carry out any pledges or promises or programme which we have laid before our constituents at the last Election. Therefore I say it is the duty of us all, whether we represent the Labour interest or Wales or the Irish interests, it is our duty to obtain a pledge from the Mover of this Amendment before it is carried that all those things which we are particularly interested in shall be passed into law at once, and that they shall have priority over everything else. I say, in the absence of any pledge of that kind, I am afraid I shall feel constrained to oppose this Amendment. To produce an Amendment and ask us to vote for it on the ground that if it is carried something is going to be introduced of which we have not yet been told, and then to say that a precedent exists for doing that—that to my mind is not a weighty precedent which ought to be followed. Finally I say before we are "off" with the present Government we ought to satisfy ourselves most conclusively what are the intentions and what is the programme of the new.

(8.45.) MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick): I felt compelled, Sir, to take part in this Debate lest it should perish from inanition.

Man after man has risen on the side of the Government to support the views of the Government, but not one word has been said on this side of the House since the first speeches. Who would think this is the first night of a new Parliament, and who would think that a great revolution has taken place in the country since we were last here? That 340 Gentlemen have been returned to this House burning with legislative zeal, and not one of them is here to take part in this discussion, or to say a word in defence of his opinions. The present state of things reflects great credit on the hon. Member for Nottingham (Mr. Arnold Morley) and the right hon. Member for Berwickshire (Mr. Marjoribanks). They have got their men under very good control already, and I shall be curious to see whether they are able to retain that control over the Members of their Party during the coming Session. A little while ago it was a taunt thrown at the Tories, in view of the long lines of Gentlemen who sat silent, never uttering a word, but to be depended on when the Division came, that they had a splendid array of brute votes. It is by votes of that class that the Member for Midlothian is now supported, and it will be interesting to see how long the rank and file will display that absolute obedience and touching confidence that they have shown to-night. We have heard from the Member for East Fife as little as possible in support of his Motion; he committed himself to nothing in defence of it. There is an old scholastic problem as to how many millions of angels could dance on the point of a needle, and while he was speaking, the problem that presented itself to my mind was, How many Members for East Fife could dance on this Amendment without committing themselves to any single definite principle. We have not been accustomed to such surprising unanimity or such touching obedience. Where are the voices which took up so much of our time in the last Parliament? Where is the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Morton) and the hon. Member for Elgin and Nairn (Mr. Seymour Keay), who were always ready to take up as much time of the House as their own Party would

allow them? This policy of secrecy, which is to be maintained on this side of the House, is not the old tradition of the Liberal Party. It has not been in the past the policy of the Member for Midlothian. It was not the policy he pursued in the matter of the Dis-establishment of the Irish Church. He brought forward his broad views in the form of a Resolution and submitted them to the House, so that at the Election which followed he might be able to ask the confidence of the country for his policy. In bringing forward these Resolutions the right hon. Gentleman, it is true, said it would not become him, either then or at any subsequent stage of the Debate, to make himself responsible for all the complicated details of the plan which would, in the end, have to give effect to his purpose. But he added—

“At the same time I should not be justified in endeavouring to shelter myself under the freedom of a Member of the Opposition from distinctly indicating to the Government, the House, and to the country the general basis and conditions of the measure which I wish to suggest.”

The right hon. Gentleman and his friends, have not, in the present instance, done anything of the kind. They have stated certain of the surrounding conditions, but they have not stated with any clearness or precision what all the country has a right to know—namely, the principles on which they propose to act in connection with this Bill, which was the mainstay of their whole policy in going to the country. They ought to have done so before the General Election, but they did not. I maintain, however, that it is now their duty to take the country into their confidence and trust the people, especially as “trust in the people” is their favourite maxim which they are never tired of flaunting in their opponents’ faces. Let them trust the people themselves. I know that nothing I can say will draw the right hon. Gentleman any further than he is inclined to go; but there are hon. Gentlemen from Ireland who are especially interested in this question, and who, I hope, will draw from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian that which we, as mere Representatives of the people at large, have signally failed in doing.

*Mr. Parker Smith*

Now, Sir, I should like to say a few words upon the composition of the majority of this present House of Commons, which was one of the points of the hon. Member for East Fife. He said, with perfect truth, that you cannot for the purposes of a Division in this House analyse the exact composition of the majority, and he said that he protested against any such proceeding in the name of the community of this still United Kingdom. It is not to us that that protest should be addressed. He should address it to his own Leader, because there is no man who has laid such stress upon that point as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian in the course of speeches both here and during his recent campaign. He was then continually bringing before the Scotch people the grievance and injustice they suffered by having the wishes of a Scotch majority overridden by an English majority in the House of Commons. It is not we that have laid stress upon that argument. We are content to accept the country as a United Kingdom, and we desire nothing more than to continue the country as such. It is the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian and his supporters who are seeking to split up the country into constituent elements. It is you, the Opposition, who have hitherto laid stress upon this argument, and now I want to know whether you are going to throw overboard all those arguments which you used when in Opposition, and forget them now that the Unionists in England have a great majority, while in this House at large you are able by the help of Irish and Scotch and Welsh votes to override that majority? In a speech at Dalkeith on the 5th July the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian said—

“My point is that the present Government have carried further than any Government, however Tory, the principle of putting down Scottish opinion by English votes. I propound to you, after the great Irish subject as a main fundamental matter, that you have to decide at this Election whether you will or not be parties to the continuance of this system.”

That is to say, the question after Home Rule is whether the Scotch people are to stand having the wishes of their

majority overridden by a Unionist majority in the House at large. Now the case is a converse one. The opinion of the majority of the Scottish people is now the same, it is to be presumed, as the opinion of this House of Commons at large. Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to carry out his own proposition? Is he prepared to say that English opinion shall never be overridden on English matters by the opinion of this House of Commons? In this country we Unionists have a very large majority indeed, both of electors and Members. I take the figures from a hostile source—the *Pall Mall Gazette* special—in regard to the House. In England the Unionists received 1,823,000 votes, while the Gladstonians received only 1,708,000. We had a majority of more than 100,000 votes in England alone. If you take Great Britain the Unionists had 2,112,000 votes, and the Gladstonians 2,098,000 votes, a majority of 14,000 on the whole of the electors of Great Britain. In England and Wales we Unionists have 270 Members as against only 225, a majority of forty-five, or, if you make Wales separate—as hon. Gentlemen from the Principality would desire—our majority comes out at seventy-three. Taking Great Britain as a whole, England, Scotland, and Wales, our majority is eighteen. Of course, Sir, the victory is not ours—it is useless to dispute that. But there are victories and victories. There are victories which, if repeated, would be fatal only to those who, for the moment, appear to have them, and in this fight I should like to know who it is that have come back with the best spirits and the greatest confidence? It seems to me it is not those Gentlemen who expect shortly to cross the floor. Is it Home Rule that has won this Election? It is in those portions of the country where the question of Home Rule has been predominant that the Unionists have gained. In Ireland we know what has happened. In the South of Scotland the gain on the Unionist side has been something most marked and most general. It has been in those portions of the country where Home Rule has been relegated to the background, and where

miscellaneous questions have been pushed to the front, that your gains have occurred. ("No, no!") I cannot go through the whole of the elections; but I will take one part of the country which I know best—the middle of Scotland. There you had Home Rule put well forward on all sides, and what happened there? Everywhere there was a most marked decrease of the majorities that were against us in previous years. Take, as an illustration, the Lothians and Berwickshire. There, in 1885, the whole country was absolutely and unquestionably Liberal. The majorities were enormous in every constituency. In the County of Berwick the majority was more than 2,500; in Midlothian 4,600; in Haddingtonshire 1,500, and in Linlithgow 2,200. The majority in these four constituencies alone was just upon eleven thousand. In 1886 there was a marked falling-off in those majorities. In Midlothian there was no contest. In Berwickshire the majority had fallen from 2,500 to 1,600; in Haddingtonshire from 1,500 to 950; and in Linlithgow from 2,200 to a little over seven hundred. How is it now? Do these constituencies show any tendency to go back to "as in 1885"—the motto to which Gladstonians attributed so much importance, and from which in the last Parliament they derived so much happiness and consolation? No, they have gone on falling. In Berwickshire you have had a further falling-off in the majority of 750; in Haddingtonshire the majority has fallen to under 300; in Linlithgow to under 200; and, most striking of all, in Midlothian you have had the majority reduced from something like 5,000 to a mere 690. In these counties, the centre of which is represented by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, whose great influence must be taken into account—in these counties you have had a falling-off of the majorities by which the Gladstonians were returned from close on eleven thousand to well under two thousand. Does that look as if your cause is growing, and as if the principles of Home Rule are popular in Scotland? These are not isolated or single constituencies. Take the con-



stituency of the hon. Member for East Fife. In 1885 he was returned by a majority of two thousand, and in 1886 by one of 374 only. During the six years that have elapsed since then you have had a most eloquent gentleman in possession of that constituency. You know how loyal Scotch constituencies are, and how great are the odds in favour of the sitting Member. Yet, notwithstanding these things, the 1886 majority of 374 has shrunk to 294. East Aberdeenshire is another striking example. In 1885 the majority was 3,300, which, in 1886, was reduced to 2,400, and now in 1892 it is only 1,600. The tide has not ceased to flow. It is flowing, and will continue to flow in the same direction, as you will see in the next General Election, which cannot be far off. Take one more case, that of Lanarkshire. There you have six constituencies, and in every one of them the same tendency is to be seen. We have won a seat in one case, and in the other cases the Unionist majorities have increased, or the Gladstonian majorities have markedly diminished. Now that is the tendency of things in Scotland. You depended upon sweeping the country and believed that Home Rule was irresistible. What is it that you can alone depend upon to maintain even your present ground? It is not Home Rule. It is in spite of Home Rule that, in those parts of the country I have mentioned, you have come out as well as you have. Here you have had the recent developments in Ireland making themselves felt most strongly and pronouncedly. In particular you have had the great Belfast Convention, producing enormous results in men's minds—results shown in the diminution of majorities, and results that would have been far more overwhelming if you had not had one single name to rely upon—one single name that has been more to you in those constituencies than any number of speeches in favour of Home Rule, and that is the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. That is what you had to depend upon. If that name were gone you would see a different state of things in Scotland. At present you have nothing more to depend upon than loyalty to a man and to a Leader—feelings which the

*Mr. Parker Smith*

Scotch have always shown to be characteristic of them as a people throughout their whole history. Why is it that we find all these changes? We have heard some talk of Peers and squires, but they have had nothing to do with these matters. It has not been in the constituencies where they have any predominance that the change has been most marked. The change has been in the great cities. Look at Edinburgh and Glasgow. In Glasgow ten years ago, before these questions arose, five out of six of the business men were Liberals without question. You cannot now find one in ten of these men who hold to the recent change in principle of the Gladstonian Party. They are Unionists, and it is in the influence of these men that the strength of the Liberal Unionist Party lies. There is another question which has had a great deal to do with this change in the majorities, and that is the question of Disestablishment. I shall be curious to see what is the attitude of the Member for Midlothian and of many Scotch Members in regard to this question. I shall be curious to see whether they are as keen supporters of Disestablishment as they have been in the past. We know that the right hon. Gentleman has himself attributed the falling-off in his majority to this very question, and I think it is absolutely certain that if it were not for personal loyalty to the right hon. Gentleman, and if an ordinary Scotch Member had contested the constituency, Midlothian would not now be represented by a supporter of Home Rule. What does the Party that reckons on coming into power propose to do when it gets there? Is it to be social work, or is it to be once more political work? The Member for the Dumfries Burghs has been talking to the Eighty Club about amended registration and one man one vote. Are these what you intend to deal with, or is it Home Rule? Do you intend to deal with the great social questions upon which so much stress has been laid during the Election, or do you intend to deal with a Constitutional question? You make no pretence that reforms are not undertaken simply to strengthen your own Party. You hold certain views with regard to the franchise which you

think will do you good, and it is that reason, and not any general ground which has been the basis of every former Reform Bill, that you desire to act. You do not seek to enfranchise; you seek to disfranchise. You want to deal with the question of one man one vote, without dealing with that infinitely more important question of bringing on one uniform level the rights of all the different electors in the different constituencies of the country. You make no pretence that that is not necessary, but you say that one is expedient and is likely to help you to gain a larger majority in the next Election, and the other question is one by which you may suffer. You make no distinction in favour of anyone except the illiterates. These are not the lines which will satisfy the desires of the electors, and all that we can hope is that the Government which we are told is to come in will have time to disappoint and disgust the constituencies. You wish to treat this Debate as a game of cricket; to declare your innings closed and to go no further. The old principle of the Liberal Party is "trust the people." You have added a corollary to that, and I do not complain of your logic. You say—"But we are the people, and, therefore, it is unnecessary that we should show our hands in any way; that we should make any sort of declaration as to what is our policy or what are our principles." These are not the lines on which the country will be prepared to accept you. These are not the lines on which a great Party expressing the desires and the will of a majority of the nation can safely rest or continue its career.

(9.20.) MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have now reached a crisis in our country's history, perhaps, more important, more fraught with consequences, than any crisis of the present century. I do not propose to follow the hon. Member for Partick (Mr. Parker Smith) into the details he has given. I am very little concerned about details. I accept that a majority of the United Kingdom have declared for the Opposition. Hitherto,

VOL. VII. [FOURTH SERIES.]

when we have been taunted with our resistance to Home Rule we have had Ireland thrown in our faces and been told that, as there was a majority in Ireland in favour of Home Rule, therefore we must grant Home Rule. But we have declined to recognise any section of the Kingdom, and have claimed to take the opinion of the United Kingdom as a whole. But the Gladstonian Party have now forsaken their demand that a majority of a section shall have their way, and now they fall back, because they would be in a minority without it, on the majority of the Kingdom as a whole. The hon. Member for East Fife described the present Unionist Party as an accidental combination. That means to say that a section of the Liberal Party have joined the Unionist Party for a purpose. There is nothing exceptional about that, and I would retort by asking him about the Front Opposition Bench—who have they joined? What accidental combination do we see on that Bench at the present time? The speech of the hon. Member was a very able one, but it was disfigured by his having gone out of his way to cast petulant slurs on the Liberal Unionist Party, revealing his own mind, which was not quite comfortable after the severe shaking he had in Scotland during the General Election. But we are not quite that ill-starred abortion of a Party which, following the steps of our Leader, he has endeavoured to make us out. I venture to say that as a Party we never had greater hopes than at the present time, especially so far as Scotland is concerned. The hon. Member says the Election has been a victory. I choose rather to call it a skirmish, which has had this good effect—we have placed our opponents in a position in which they will have to declare themselves and reveal their policy, which hitherto they have carefully abstained from doing. They have yet to learn the full strength of the Unionist feeling in this country. They learned it in 1886, and the reason they are not feeling it now so much is because six years have elapsed and there are numbers of electors who think the danger is gone by. But let us see this 1893 Bill, and I venture to

H

say that the Unionist feeling will be as great or greater, especially in Scotland, in 1893 as it was in 1886. The hon. Member for Morpeth was called to curse us, but rather remained to bless. It has been said that Bills should only be prepared and carried by those who believed in them, but that is a departure from the old democratic principle of measures not men, and, coming from the lips of a Labour Representative seems to indicate that the Labour Party is being dragged at the tail of partisanship. The Member for East Fife described the legislation which the Unionist Government had carried through as a huckstering, false, and peddling imposture. Let us examine that. Take the Miners Act, to which the Member for Morpeth especially referred. It had been praised in set terms by the hon. Member himself, by the hon. Member for Rhondda (Mr. Abraham), and by the hon. Member for Normanton (Mr. Pickard), and I ask could any higher testimony be possible? Does that answer to the description of the Member for East Fife of imposture? Again, the Member for Morpeth, speaking at the annual meeting of the Northumbrian miners, said that the first year's operation of that Act had resulted in less sacrifice of human life than in any previous year in the history of the industry. I appeal to the Labour Members to say whether there can be any more worthy object of legislation than that of saving human life? What the hon. Member said was that

"Whereas there was formerly a life lost for every 245 men employed, since the passing of that Act there was only one life lost in 602."

What does that mean? It means that where five lives were sacrificed that Act had reduced the number to two. Is that meddling or peddling legislation? No one can say so. Let us look also at the rural policy of the Unionist Government. This Government has passed an Allotments Act—the first Government that ever did it, but not the first Government that solemnly promised to do so and then broke their promises. They have passed a Small Holdings Act, which for the first time introduced an element of hope into the lives of the rural labourers, and offered

*Mr. Jesse Collings*

them the prospect of a career which they have never had before. Was that meddling and peddling legislation? I am aware of the deliberate manner in which that legislation has been misrepresented. These Acts may be incomplete; what Acts of Parliament are not? But these Acts have put hundreds of thousands of persons in possession of holdings. The Allotments Acts before 1881 were lauded to the skies by hon. Members sitting round me, but as soon as they were improved by the Acts of the Unionist Government they were everything that was bad. But, however few or many of the labouring population have secured land through the Unionist legislation, there is not a man in Great Britain who has got an acre through Gladstonian legislation. Let us see what the imposture of the Factory Acts legislation is. I will give the testimony of the one best able to speak on the point. Mr. Birtwhistle, Secretary to the Textile Factory Workers, said—

"I can scarcely do justice to the Act without going further into details than I have time for at present. It is of the utmost importance to factory workers."

And he went on to point out that it would largely increase the earnings of winders, and other branches. Is that imposture? I think if the Labour Party is wise it will adopt the old democratic principle, "measures not men." There is another feature of this factory legislation. Taking the workers in Blackburn, before the Act was passed, in 1890, twenty-five out of every 100 who died were between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five—that is all young people, and we can see what a sacrifice that is. The ordinary mortality now between those ages among cotton-spinners is eight out of every 100, and among outdoor labourers five out of every 100. By the testimony of those who are entitled to speak that Act goes as far as human foresight and arrangements can go to put an end to this great mortality, and, at the same time, to increase the earnings to the enormous extent mentioned by Mr. Birtwhistle. Is that legislative imposture? And I put the question specially to the Labour Members. I

think their silence admits that it is not. If the Labour Party is to do any good it must not be bound hand and foot to any political Party, and must not be hoodwinked by men on the Opposition Benches who, with one or two exceptions, wish to God that Home Rule had been buried in the midst of the sea. I would like to give the House an instance or two more. Take our seamen—and I will quote Mr. Plimsoll, whose authority nobody will dispute. He said—

“Speaking in the interests of those who man our Merchant Navy, and that of their wives and children, I strongly advise all to vote for candidates whose election would help to retain Her Majesty's present Ministers in Office. I am equally sure, if the present Government is retained, we may confidently expect such further reforms as can be shown to be necessary and reasonable, as well as loyal and faithful administration of Acts already passed.”

He goes on to say that he is not aware that the Leader of the Opposition has ever uttered a word or raised a finger to help seamen, and that he was sick of knocking at the door of the Gladstonian Party for help. On the other hand, he said they had had the sympathy and active help of the Conservatives. Having said he was certain of future legislation in the same direction, he concluded—

“To secure these objects, we, who think sailors' lives are of more importance than Party politics, must work with a will in support of those who will help to keep the present Government in power.”

Are sailors' lives of more importance than Party politics. If they are, will not the hon. Member for Middlesbrough (Mr. J. H. Wilson) take the course suggested by Mr. Plimsoll? The hon. Member for East Fife spoke about free education, and added that it was always upheld by the Gladstonian Party or Liberal Party—the Repeal Party as it is now. The hon. Member must think we are absolutely ignorant of all political history. As a matter of fact, no Liberal Party ever included free education either in its Queen's Speech or its programme. Is it not ridiculous, with these facts before us, for the Gladstonian candidates, as they have done, to claim it as their own? Free education is the gift of the

Unionist Party. I wish the Liberal Party had given it. Let us go on to another piece of imposture. There is the Local Government Act, which has conferred the rights of citizenship on the great mass of the country voters. Is that apiece of imposture? The right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) said that it was one of the greatest measures of modern times, and that it was the first portion of a mighty work and the foundation of a great edifice. Does the right hon. Gentleman call that a piece of imposture? Then why does he not say so? As to the statement that those should carry out a policy who believe in it, let me remind the House that the so-called Liberal Party—Liberal no longer—is the Repeal Party, with one policy swallowing up every other, the repeal of the Union between Great Britain and Ireland. I might keep the House all night with instances of “imposture.” There is the Merchandise Marks Act, which has given work to thousands in the manufacturing districts; the Margarine Act; there is taxation remitted, rates reduced. Then for six years they have kept this country out of war, instead of spending twenty millions sterling on miserable little wars. They have instead devoted the money to giving free education and the reduction of taxation. They have also appointed Commissions on the Hours of Railway Servants and on Labour. The hon. Member for Battersea (Mr. John Burns) a few weeks ago said that those Commissions had already caused the companies to reduce the hours and increase the wages, and went on to say that by that means a substantial victory had been gained. The hon. Member calls these things benefits, and puts them above mere Party triumph. At any rate, there, again, I leave that to be settled by the hon. Member for Battersea. I pass over what has been done for Ireland. I might refer to the tranquillity of the country; I might refer to the prosperity of the country; I might refer to the charges of the Judges. The Government has done good for all who believe that law and order are the first necessities of civilisation. I heard the questions which

were put by the hon. Member for Longford—questions to which, no doubt, by some little arrangement he knows all about the answers, from the curious manner in which they were put. The Irish Party know what they are about. I could wish that the English Labour Party knew what they are about. If I were a Home Ruler in the sense in which the Irish Party are Home Rulers I should say—"If anybody is to be sold, let it be the English and not the Irish." One or other will be sold. We have asked for information. The hon. Member for East Fife wanted to know, you know, for ever so long, but not a word came. Are they afraid to tell us? Is it a silence of shame or a silence of ignorance—one or the other? But the pleasant and valuable part of the present position is that the time is very close when they must show their hand. Now, looking for a minute or two, if the House will bear with me, at the programme—the unfulfilled programme—of the present Government, I may say there are District Councils and parochial reform. (Laughter.) Yes; in some of the villages I have been through I have seen large placards with "Vote for Cobb and Parish Councils" on them, and "Vote for Cobb and No Workhouse." (Laughter.) Well, but then the hon. Member for Rugby and his friends are not going to use these votes for the purpose of carrying Parish Councils and parochial reform, but to turn out the men who have got the job in hand in order to put in others who are going to carry no District Councils, no parochial reform but Home Rule. Wait till next January—ay, wait till Friday next—when you will see these Gentlemen voting against the Party who has this work in hand, and voting to put a Party in power who are pledged up to the eyes to deal with something quite different. Then the Government have the Employers' Liability Bill in hand. (Laughter.) Yes; and there again you laugh. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary introduced an Employers' Liability Bill. My hon. Friend says "it is a sham"; it is a better one than was introduced by the Gladstonian Government in 1886; it is a far better one. It was

*Mr. Jesse Collings*

based on the Report of a Select Committee, the majority of whom were not Conservative, but so-called Liberals—I mean men who call themselves Liberals, but whom the old Liberals do not call so. One of the pleasant incidents of this Debate is to see that even the hon. Member for Northampton seems to be shackled—shall I say by the golden chains of office—and rendered dumb. I would suggest to right hon. Gentlemen that they should make the hon. Member Secretary to the Treasury in the new Government, so that he may bring in the Estimates, including the Royal grants, and such like. But what I was about to mention about this Employers' Liability Bill is that the late Mr. Bradlaugh spoke in the highest terms of that Bill. He said he knew it was difficult for the Government to pass any measure of the kind, but he could promise them his support and the gratitude of the working classes if they passed the Bill. It was stated in that Debate that it was passed from Party motives, that the Government might not have the credit of passing it. Labour again was sacrificed to Party. If we are able to show that the legislation proposed was better than that which was proposed by the Gladstonians when they got into power in 1886, why is that legislation to be called an imposture and to be stopped? It is said that it did not deal with the doctrine of common employment. Neither did the other Bill, and it did not profess to do it. But this Bill reduces it down to the vanishing point, which the old Bill in 1886 did not attempt to do. Then there are other matters which the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade referred to in his speech at Bristol, a speech that did good to the heart of every man who values legislation for the benefit it is going to confer on the people. He told them of a scheme for cottage reform in our rural districts. Well, that would have been carried, no doubt. All this progressive legislation, which I deny is of the character of imposture, will be stopped for Home Rule, and by whom? By Members who have been returned on the advocacy of these very things.

Every man who votes to displace the Government that has got these things in hand votes for the indefinite postponement of them and for the sake of putting Home Rule in their place. I do not think it can be disputed that when next January comes if Home Rule be passed there will be a Dissolution. ("No!") Oh, yes, especially if a certain number of the Irish Members are to have their own Parliament and come to legislate for us there must be a Dissolution—there must be a Dissolution. But suppose it is not carried, will there be a Dissolution? I think there will be two parties to that. The fact is the Irish Members are our masters. They say if these right hon. Gentlemen do not do exactly as we want them we will turn them out in twenty-four hours. Let me quote again the hon. Member—I forget where he sits for. He said the best way to get Home Rule was to knock out one Government after another, and show the English people that until Home Rule was granted ducks and drakes would be made of their Constitution; and if necessary they would be running a General Election every six months. I ask the English County Members where is their Newcastle Programme now, on the strength of which they have obtained votes and have seats in this House? He went on to say that their policy was to accept what was good from either Whig or Tory, and to carry out that policy they might be found voting one night with one Party and another night with another Party, and in that way they might go on winning much benefit and reform for Ireland. Perfectly right. But what has the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) to say to that? He is one of the few who believe in Home Rule; the others, most of them, are worshippers in a temple in which they are not believers. They have got their idol, but it is of the nature of idolatry for the idolaters never to examine their idol. But the idol is not only being examined, but being put under a microscope. I will give right hon. Gentlemen six months before all these things are found out. Votes for the reform of Parish Councils will be seen to mean Home Rule; votes ob-

tained for the Newcastle programme will all be found out to mean Home Rule, and "Once bitten, twice shy." Men, I believe, will not stumble over the same stone twice if they know it. Then I should like to ask finally what this Home Rule is? I have seen in the villages I have been through again "Vote for so and so, for Home Rule for Ireland and for the villages." Does the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle accept the village style as the style of Home Rule he means? Perhaps he will tell us before this Debate is over. Has he consulted his masters; and if he has consulted them has he consulted those who have got their seats on gas and water? The old saying about a man being "between the Devil and the deep sea" was surely never exemplified more strongly than in the case of the right hon. Gentleman. The Irish Members, at all events, have never deceived us. I have never denied that the debt should be paid; and nobody rejoices more than I do that during the past ten years some of the debt has been paid. The Irish Members have never attempted to deceive us. The hon. Member for Waterford the other day said this—and I want the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, who so often laughs at me, to express assent or dissent, or to give some evidence that he takes an interest in this question, as I know he does—

"It is our ultimatum, our irreducible minimum on this question, the Irish Parliament must be absolutely supreme"—

mark the adjective—

"absolutely supreme, free from interference or control in the management of the affairs of Ireland."

I heartily agree with that. If you are to have a Parliament at all, there is nothing between a tribute-paying province and perfect freedom. Then the hon. Member for a Division of Liverpool—I forget which Division, the Scotland Yard Division—(laughter).—I am afraid my hon. Friend the Member for Poplar (Mr. Buxton) revealed his inmost thoughts when he attached an Irish Member to Scotland Yard. He was unknowingly candid, and in my simplicity misled me. But the House

knows who I mean. That hon. Member said—

"Every Irishman would indignantly reject, as part of Home Rule, the right of the English Parliament to revise or to reverse Bills passed by an Irish Parliament."

(Cheers.) Oh, yes, perfectly right—

"And if Mr. Gladstone proposed such, he would be disentitled to the name of statesman."

Very well, what do my hon. Friends of the gas and water persuasion think of that; what do my hon. Friends, who have got seats on declaring that Home Rule meant the same thing as Parish Councils think of that? Had not they better put their house in order in time to go down and face the same audiences with the hard reality of a Bill, that makes good these utmost demands, asked for by the men who have the right to make them, and without whom the Government could not exist for twenty-four hours? I think the situation is a serious one for some Members who have obtained votes on false pretences. I could quote a variety of statements by hon. Gentlemen, but I will quote only one Member, the Member for Cork (Mr. W. O'Brien), who spoke the other day—

"As to the talk of these men about Home Rule being suspended altogether and put in the background by the Liberal Party, the Irish Party have not only the assurance that separates the man of honour from the unprincipled scoundrel"—(that is putting things very clearly)—"but the Irish people have the best of all possible guarantees against Liberal treachery, because we could, and we would, within twenty-four hours, put the Liberal traitors out of Office. This new Parliament must have Home Rule as its first object and as its supreme object. Mr. Gladstone proclaims that just as emphatically and as passionately as we do."

(Cheers.) Yes, it is quite true; but it is not the kind of Home Rule my hon. Friends the English county and other Members advocate—Home Rule in gas and water, for their constituents will want a little information—

An hon. MEMBER: Not in Lancashire.

MR. COLLINGS: Lancashire? In Lancashire the great bulk of Gladstonian Members whose majorities are under five hundred sit by the Irish vote. They are not English Repre-

*Mr. Jesse Collings*

sentatives. ("Yes.") I repeat, those Gladstonians who had small majorities in Lancashire sit here by the Irish vote. That explains why some hon. Members must go any length, not, indeed, to meet what their English constituents want, but what the Irish electors want, and very rightly, as they put them into power. That will be an element in future elections, provided that the new Government does not carry out this bond to the letter. Not a man of them will come back here unless he votes exactly as hon. Members below the Gangway order him to do. But again, what about the English and Scotch county Members, who do not at all understand it in that light? Let me conclude this quotation. ("Hear!") Oh! I dare say it is not the pleasantest reading in the world for some hon. Members, but it is the fact nevertheless.

"Mr. Gladstone proclaims that just as emphatically and as passionately as we do. If there was any attempt to shunt Home Rule or to drive it into the background, there would follow the expulsion from Office of the Ministry that would attempt it. I candidly speak for myself as one individual; but upon that point there is no possibility of difference among Irish Nationalists."

There, again, the Irish Members are candid. They have never swerved from what they have wanted, and no English or Scotch Member, whenever anything so extreme is brought forward, can charge a single Irishman with having spoken a doubtful word in any of his utterances. Now that is a very nice position, a position promising a good deal of space for repentance, and, perhaps, promising a great deal of pleasure to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler), whose speeches I have carefully read. They are able speeches, but if they mean anything in their definition of Home Rule they mean only a modest piece of local government. I think, too, the Wolverhampton people understand them in that sense. I would ask right hon. Gentlemen on the Bench before me which is right? Are the Irish Members right, or are the other Members who take a more moderate view of Home Rule? In other words, which are they going to throw over—the Irish or the English?

They will have to make their choice; cannot they do it now? I rely upon my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) to say which, because he has convictions on the subject, and I hope he will enlighten us. Now, I remember when I was in the West of England reading a speech made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir W. Harcourt), at Plymouth, only a week or two before he executed the great right-about face. It is astounding with what agility and completeness the change was made from anti-Home Rule to Home Rule. The speech was made in September, 1885, and the change, I think, was made in February or March, 1886—not a very long time in which to turn everything round about. The right hon. Gentleman then said—

“But, gentlemen, there has been a still more serious question than boycotting raised in Ireland, because since the declaration of Mr. Parnell there can be no doubt what is the policy”—

and remember that policy has never changed—

‘which he and his Party have adopted. It is the policy of absolute separation of the two countries.’

That was the opinion then of the right hon. Gentleman.

“Now, how has that declaration been met? Two speakers eminently entitled to represent the Liberal Party—Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain—have spoken upon this subject, and they have spoken in a manner worthy of their position and worthy of the Party they represent.”

In the speech of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife, my right hon. Friend (Mr. J. Chamberlain) and all the more humble Liberal Unionists like myself—(“Hear!”)—yes, I do not pretend to be anything else—were accused of political apostacy. Let me ask the hon. Member for East Fife which of the two right hon. Gentlemen is the apostate now? We are a long-suffering people, but we can turn sometimes. We never needlessly make an attack, but we can resist one. In September, 1885, a few months before he completely turns round, the right hon. Member for Derby speaks in language that could not be stronger in condemnation of and in opposition to

Home Rule, and yet it is my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham who is accused of political apostacy. I do not think the House or the country will have any difficulty in deciding, if there be political apostacy, who is the apostate. I apologise to the House for the time I have spoken, but I am anxious, as we all are, to hear from the right hon. Member for Derby what he will have, because he has said what he will not have. He will not have Fenian Home Rule. I am inclined to think that my Irish Friends will, and if they will, the right hon. Gentleman must. He may talk about political apostates. I read a short time ago a memoir of Dr. Johnson. He had a friend, an actor, remarkable for the variety of characters he could assume, and he relates that one night, going behind the scenes, he met this great man and asked him, “Well, Tom, and what art thou to-night?” I think we may address that question to the right hon. Gentleman. It is germane to the great crisis in our country’s history. What art thou to-night? Is it Fenian Home Rule that you are seeking the confidence of the country upon, or are you not allowed to say what it is you are about to undertake Office to carry out? There never was in all the history of this country—I believe never even in times of corruption or of difficulty—such a period of humiliation for a great historic Party. We Liberal Unionists have a right to speak warmly on this subject. In 1885 the Liberal Party was placed in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian in a high state of efficiency. It had taken ages to build it up to become what it was then called, a great instrument for good. It was placed in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman, not as his property, but in trust to carry out the measures for which it was created. What has he done with it? He destroyed it in 1886, and since then he and his colleagues have been dragging it in the dirt. That is the fact about the so-called Liberal Party; and I, for one, would rather, as we have done, join the other section of the Unionist Party. (Cheers.) Oh, if it is a comfort, be assured that we were



never so united as now. We only needed the present position to make the Union prominent again, because the position of 1886 has become a little dim—"Hear!"—aye, but when it will be renewed in 1893 and become fresh again it will inspire not only the Unionist Party, but, I believe, the electorate of Great Britain to show that the verdict that has just been given is regarded by them as only the first round in this great Constitutional fight. The hon. Member for East Fife indulged in prophecies as to what would be the result. I indulge in none; but if he thinks he is going to come out of the fight as he says, then his experience may fail him, for the subject may no longer be concealed or misrepresented. The same great considerations which led us—and we think led us rightly and worthily—to unite to settle the question in a direction contrary to that in which it was brought forward, will be present in redoubled force in 1893; and if I were to prophesy, I would say that something like the result we had in 1886 will happen again. I have been led to speak at this length from a feeling of gladness that we have at last come to close quarters on this great question. I see the hon. and learned Member for East Fife is now present. I have raised many questions in his absence, and I would only now recommend him to treat with the various gentlemen to whom I have referred him to settle who is right—he or they. I mean the Labour Party. I am inclined to take their opinions, made so completely and unreservedly, on labour questions, before the academic opinions of the hon. and learned Member. One thing in conclusion I would say to him. When he again speaks of the Liberal Unionist Party I think he will do better justice to himself, his speech, and his position if he confines himself to arguments, and not seek to use harsh terms of accusation, if not abuse, which, if they do anything, reveal a somewhat unsettled habit of mind as to the position of that "ill-starred abortion" to which he referred.

(10.30.) MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I desire to seize the very earliest opportunity of briefly explain-

*Mr. Jesse Collings*

ing to the House the reasons which actuate me in the vote which I am about to give on this question. I will start by saying at once that I intend to cast my vote in favour of the Amendment moved by the hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith). My reasons for taking this course are twofold. First of all, it seems to me to be the plain duty of every Irish Nationalist Representative in this House to vote in favour of turning the present Government out of Office. The present Government has been for over six years in power, and the government of Ireland during that period has been based upon principles diametrically opposed to those which are dear to the hearts of all Irish Nationalists. It has been based on the idea that Ireland is simply a province of Great Britain, whereas we claim, on the other hand, that Ireland is a nation and that it has the rights of a nation. It has been based on an insolent assumption that the Irish are an inferior race—that they are unfit as Hottentots for the exercise and the enjoyment of free institutions, whereas we believe that we are the equals of Englishmen, judged by every test which goes to make up a nation. The Irish government of the right hon. Gentleman the present First Lord of the Treasury, based as it has been upon these principles, was carried out for six years by violence, cruelty, and, as we believe, by fraud. The Constitution, at any rate, has been in Ireland permanently suspended. The right of trial by jury has been permanently abrogated; the right of freedom of speech has been invaded; and, from the Lord Lieutenant down to the humblest police officer in the remotest country districts, the rule of the right hon. Gentleman has been characterised by an unconstitutional violence, by a wanton disregard of the most cherished aspirations of the people, and by an almost incredible ignorance, as it seems to us, of the most elementary questions in this Irish problem. But now, after six years which to the mass of the Irish people have been six long and weary years of waiting, the day of judgment for this system of government has come; and, for my own part, I

apprehend it is the first duty of every Irish Nationalist in this House to assist in driving this Government from Office, regardless altogether of the question as to whether we are likely to fare any better at all at the hands of those who may succeed them. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if the case simply stood thus, I would still feel it my duty to vote in favour of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife. But the case does not stand thus. The Government of the right hon. Gentleman is a Government which is pledged in a most solemn way in direct opposition to our claim for national self-government. The Party, however, which is opposed to them is a Party which is pledged to the principle of conceding self-government to our country; and for my part—and I hope that this statement of mine will be borne in mind when I come to other portions of my speech, I sincerely hope that the speediest and the freest possible opportunity will be given to the Party on this side of the House to redeem the pledges which they have given to the Irish people. Now, Sir, I desire to examine for a moment what I understand those pledges to have been. The pledges of the Liberal Party to Ireland have been two-fold. First of all, I understand they are pledged in the most solemn manner to the statement that Ireland blocks the way—that not merely the consideration and discussion, but the effective settlement of the Irish National Question, must be the first work of Parliament, and that until that settlement is brought about those great English questions which are crying for reform must, by the very necessity of the case, remain in abeyance. And, secondly, I understand that the Liberal Party is pledged to the condition that the Irish National Question shall be so settled that, by satisfying the well-known aspirations of the Irish people, it will be finally, once for all, disposed of. On these two points, notwithstanding the specific character of the pledges which from time to time have been given by the leading Members of the Liberal Party, there exists—and there is no use disguising the fact—among certain large sections of the Irish people at this moment, the very gravest

anxieties and uncertainties; and, for my part, I feel that I should not be doing my duty if I did not do my best to utilise this Debate in order to dissipate these doubts and anxieties. As to the question that Ireland blocks the way, the most explicit statements and pledges have been made by the Leaders of the Liberal Party. On the 21st June, 1886, speaking in Edinburgh, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian said—

“I think you understand why it is that my anxiety to deal with English, Scotch, and Welsh questions induces me to insist so pertinaciously upon the Irish question. I will endeavour to illustrate what I think is our position. It may be briefly stated in one word, describing the position of those who attend parties in London, or perhaps in Edinburgh, and who want to get away, but who find that their carriage cannot get to the door. Ireland blocks the way. Supposing you are in a railway train. Its diversified, momentary population are all anxious, for one reason or another, to reach their destinations; one to transact an important matter of business, one to visit a sick relative, one to welcome a child from distant lands, and with some trial of your patience and some temptation to irritation you find that the train has come to a standstill. Immediately every window of the train is filled with the protrusion of a large portion of the person of a passenger, and if they can get sight of a guard they ask angrily, “Why do you stop the train?” The guard points along the line and shows that the rails are occupied by a set of stones, placed there, probably, by some mischievous persons. I am sorry to say that innumerable persons are responsible by their neglect, or by their misdeeds, for having placed the Irish difficulty in the way of the nation. But you understand the first duty is to get the rails clear, and when you have got the rails clear the train will go on and you will reach your destination.”

Now it is as well to remark that it is not the Irish people who made the claim that Ireland blocks the way. They would certainly have been justified in making it, although many English Members may say it was an extravagant claim. At any rate, it was not made by the Irish people; it was made for Ireland, and the pledge was given by the Leader of the Liberal Party, who said that English, Scotch, and Welsh reforms could not be dealt with until the question of Home Rule had not merely been considered, not merely discussed, and voted upon on a First and Second Reading of a Bill, but passed into law, and until the block was thus

removed out of the way. The same pledge was made afterwards, in, perhaps, even more explicit language, by the right hon. Gentleman at Liverpool on the 28th June of the same year, when he said—

"Do not conceal it from yourselves. I will exhibit it in a more amusing point of view, if I can, though the matter is a serious one. Ireland is the mistress of the situation. Ireland is mounted on the back of England, as the old man in the *Arabian Nights* was mounted on the back of Sinbad the Sailor. Do you recollect that incident? I will read the passage. Sinbad is upon one of his islands. He sees a venerable-looking old man, and invites him to get on his back. The old man mounts accordingly. He takes him wherever he wishes to go. But, at last, he begins to wish that the old gentleman would dismount. 'I said to him "Dismount." He made the demand, a very modest one, "Dismount at thy leisure," but he would not get off my back, and wound his legs round my neck. I was affrighted and would have cast him off, but he clung to me and gripped my neck with his legs till I was well-nigh choked. The world grew black in my sight, and I fell senseless to the ground, like one dead!' Sinbad is the Parliament of England. The old man is Ireland, who we, by our foolish initiative, have almost compelled to place herself upon our backs; and she rides you, and she will ride you, until, listening to her reasonable demands, you shall consent to some arrangement that justice and policy alike say are right. So much for the appeal to prudence. I want to see that Parliament go to work, and I know it cannot go to work effectively. Let it struggle as it will, the legs are gripping the neck; it is well-nigh throttled; the world grows black in its sight, and virtually it falls to the ground; and at the end of each Session some beggarly account is presented to the world of the good it has not been able to do and the laws it has been incompetent to make."

Now, nothing can be more explicit than that speech of the right hon. Gentleman. From June, 1886, down to about a year ago, that was the acknowledged and unquestioned policy of the whole Liberal Party. Up to that time no voice was raised in England, either in the Press or on the platform, to question for one moment the contention that the Home Rule Question should be settled, and finally settled, before it could be deemed possible to deal with those questions now comprised in what is known as the Newcastle programme. Upon that policy we worked for six years in support of the Liberal Party. We helped them on the platforms of England, and assisted them in winning

*Mr. John Redmond*

many of their bye-elections in this country. I am entitled, therefore, to ask whether that is the policy of the Liberal Party to-day? I am disappointed not to hear an encouraging cheer from the Liberal Benches. Surely we are entitled to some information on this question. We are not responsible for doubts having been raised about it. I must say candidly that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, so far as his personal utterances go, is not responsible either; but the Liberal Party has been speaking through many mouths, and through the columns of the leading Liberal papers in different parts of the country, and doubts have been raised as to whether the Liberal policy is the same as it was in June, 1886. I repeat that those doubts have not been raised by the Irish Members, but by utterances which have come from leading Members of the Liberal Party. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) speaks, we are told, with the authority of a considerable number of Liberal Members, and on the 21st July of this year, after enumerating a number of measures which in his opinion ought to be passed, including a Parish Councils Bill, a Legislative Reform Bill, a Payment of Members Bill, and a Local Option Bill, he said—

"When we have carried these Bills, then we can bring in our Home Rule Bill."

I quote that for the purpose of emphasizing my statement that doubts as to change of policy have arisen, not without reason, from statements made by leading Members of the Liberal Party themselves. Therefore, our position in this matter is not an unreasonable one. We admit that, concurrently with Home Rule, it may be possible to deal with certain English questions; but that is a very different thing from postponing the introduction of the Bill until a programme of legislation has been carried out which, I venture to say, will take four or five years of a hard-working Parliament. We do not object to dealing, concurrently with Home Rule, with certain English questions, but they must be such questions as will assist in the carrying of Home Rule, and such

questions as will not impede or delay its progress or divert public attention from it; and we cannot support any English measure which may excite acute political interest or become a primary subject of national agitation so as to relegate Home Rule, in the minds of the people, to a secondary place. Nor, on other grounds, could we consistently support, before Home Rule is passed into law, a measure which in any way will lead to a redistribution of political power in these islands by which the political power of Ireland would, in the slightest degree, be impaired. We demand from the Liberal Party the fulfilment of the pledge given in 1886—namely, that Home Rule should be the first Bill introduced as soon as Parliament meets for effective business; that it should be pushed on through all its stages; that it should be sent, on an early day, to the House of Lords, and, if rejected there, that it should not be dropped or hung up in favour of any other portion of the Newcastle programme. I pass on now to the second pledge which I assert the Liberal Party made to the people of Ireland, and which is, perhaps, more important than the first. It is that the Home Rule measure should be a measure satisfactory to the National aspirations of the Irish people. On this question I regret that we have been left in ignorance. I do not know whether many Members of the House have read the most able and interesting pamphlet issued a few months ago by Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, entitled *A New Constitution for Ireland*. In that pamphlet Sir Charles said he regretted that there was no public discussion going on amongst the Irish people as to the measure of Home Rule that would satisfy them. It has been said that the people most concerned, the people of Ireland, must have an opportunity, of publicly discussing the various schemes which may be proposed. This necessary discussion has not only been discouraged, it has been actually choked off in Ireland. During the last six years there has practically been no discussion in Ireland, except such as we have raised recently as to the kind of Home Rule which will be satisfactory to the

national aspirations. We know what the Bill of 1886 was; but the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) has informed the country that it is dead, and the right hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) declared, not very long ago, for the first time, that the scheme of 1886 was to be changed, in this respect at any rate—that the Irish Members, or some Irish Members, were to be retained at Westminster. We take the view that this retention of the Irish Members is a fundamental change in the scheme of 1886; that it is such a fundamental change as to affect the whole scheme, and until we know how far it is proposed to allow the presence of the Irish Members to affect the other provisions of the Bill, it is utterly impossible for us to discuss this question at all. Therefore we say we are in absolute ignorance with respect to the scheme that is to be proposed, and apparently we may continue in ignorance until a cut-and-dried proposal is brought down to that Table, and then we shall be, as in 1886, in a position of most terrible difficulty—the difficulty of being forced either to accept this cut-and-dried scheme in all its main features, as it is proposed, or else to take the enormous responsibility of rejecting it and driving the Government of the day from power. For our part, we asked for some information of the main features of the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman at a time when we believed that the production of this information would be of use to the cause of Home Rule and of the Liberal Party; that was before the Elections took place. Our demand was refused, and it seems now that we are to have Parliament prorogued until January or February next, and, so far as the discussion of Home Rule is concerned, these months are to be wasted, and we are to be left in ignorance of what is proposed for us. Of course the right hon. Gentleman is entitled to withhold information until he places his Bill upon that Table, but when he takes that course he places upon us the imperative duty of again making it perfectly clear to the House, to the right hon. Gentleman, to the

Liberal Party, and to everybody concerned what is the very least that Irishmen will accept as a final settlement of their national claims. Last Session I quoted from a declaration on this question on the 25th January, 1891, by the late Mr. Parnell. Mr. Parnell said—

"There can be no mistake about it, we want a Parliament with full power to manage the affairs of Ireland, and with no English veto, whether on the appointment of your leader or the laws you shall make. A veto of that kind would break down and destroy your Parliament before it had been two years in existence. There must be no veto, other than the Constitutional veto of the Crown, as it is exercised by the Crown on the Imperial Parliament."

That is a definition which holds good to this day. I assert that no Nationalist in Ireland, or in this House or elsewhere, will venture to say that the Irish National claims will be satisfied by a scheme one whit less extreme than that which is shadowed forth in the quotation I have read. We do not believe in a policy of instalment in this National question. We believe this concession of Home Rule will be regarded by many Englishmen in the nature of an experiment. It will be judged by its success, and if we have not full, free, and unfettered control of Irish affairs our government by that Parliament will be a failure. And if it is a failure that Parliament will be taken from us again, and, perhaps, for a hundred years the chance of getting self-government will have gone. Therefore, we cannot accept a policy of instalment. In two or three words let me say what I understand to be the meaning and the definition of Home Rule given by Mr. Parnell. It seems to me that the main question—because it dominates all others—is, how can the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament be sustained consistently with the concession of a free and unfettered control of Irish affairs to an Irish Legislature? The hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Bryce), in the course of the discussion on the Home Rule Bill in 1886, made allusion to this question of the supremacy of Parliament, in which he said that the omnipotence of Parliament was

*Mr. John Redmond*

proved by the fact that there was nothing above it or behind it, but one Parliament could not bind its successor. One Parliament might pass an Act, but it could be revised or repealed by the following Parliament. For the purpose of my argument, I admit, from a strictly Constitutional point of view, that is an admirable exposition of the law on the question of the supremacy of Parliament. The rights of Parliament after the concession of an Irish Legislature would, no doubt, in theory remain intact. They would remain dormant so far as Irish affairs were concerned, but a Party compact would have been entered into between this Parliament and the people of Ireland to the effect that these powers and rights should remain in future dormant so long as the Irish Parliament exists. Such a compact would not, I admit, in strict theory of law bind successive Parliaments; but the hon. Member for Aberdeen, in the same speech, said that such a compact would become and must be permanent, because it would constitute a moral obligation on Parliament not to act contrary to the Statute. It comes to this, therefore: that what we ask is that in this Home Rule scheme there shall be a specific undertaking—a clause specifically undertaking—that while the Irish Parliament continued in existence the powers of the Imperial Parliament to legislate for Ireland should never be used. In point of actual fact, the Imperial Parliament would retain its power to take away our Legislature, but we should require a formal compact with Ireland to the effect that while that Legislature lasted it should have a free and unfettered control of Irish affairs. It is no answer to say that the Irish Parliament might pass Statutes in excess of its powers. That is a case to be dealt with by that tribunal which will have to be granted in Ireland, as it has been granted in every country where a Constitution has been granted. What we object to is not the retention of the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament in the sense that the Imperial Parliament can take away the Irish Legislature, but we do object to the retention of the right of revision, of amendment, review, and repeal of specific

Acts of the Irish Parliament acting within its proper limits. I saw the other day an interesting speech on this very point in reference to the Constitution of Canada; and we might ask, if no such provisions as I have mentioned exists in connection with the Canadian Legislature, why ask for such protection for Ireland? The answer is perfectly simple. Under the Bill of 1886, the Members were not going to sit at Westminster, and in the Canadian Constitution Canadian Members do not sit at Westminster. The power of interfering in Canadian affairs is absolutely a dead letter, because there is no temptation to the Imperial Parliament to bother itself with Canadian affairs, about which it understands very little, and with which it would be incompetent to deal. But if Irish Members are sitting here, there will be a daily and hourly temptation to induce you to put into force this power, unless you specifically undertake by Parliamentary compact to suspend that power while our Parliament exists. I am convinced that on this point the right hon. Member for Midlothian is not very far divided from us, because on dealing with the Home Rule Bill in 1886 he said the Parliament he wanted to give Ireland was a practically independent body, independent in the discharge of its statutory functions; and, speaking later in the same year, he said that the Parliament would have a real, practical independent management of its own affairs. I must also refer to the question of the veto. Mr. Parnell demanded that the veto of the Crown should be exercised as it is exercised in Imperial affairs. That is that the veto of the Crown should be exercised in accordance with the usage of the Constitution, which prescribes that it shall be used only in accordance with the advice of the Ministers of the day. What we mean is that the veto shall be used under the advice of the Irish Ministers of the day. During the discussion immediately before the Election, Mr. Oscar Browning, who, I suppose, speaks with some authority on this Constitutional question, repeatedly said that the only veto that the Liberal Party or that he would agree to would be the veto to be exercised on Irish

affairs of the Viceroy on the advice of the English Ministers of the Crown. That would make the Home Rule Bill a sham and a farce. It would be re-enacting, in another form, the old Poyning's Law, against which the Irish Parliament so long struggled. It would be impossible for the Irish Legislature to pass any single Act on Irish affairs within the scope of its functions if it had to receive the sanction of British Ministers responsible to the majority of the British Parliament. Irish Ministers would be powerless, and Irish legislative efforts would be beneath contempt. I do not believe that was the intention of the Bill of 1886. I have endeavoured to inform myself by reading a series of essays on the subject by Lord Thring, who I believe was the draftsman of the Government, and drafted the Home Rule Bill, and he laid it down that the veto should be exercised on the advice of Irish, and not of English, Ministers. Further than that, the hon. and learned Member for Hackney (Sir Charles Russell), speaking in this House in 1886, said, with regard to the veto being exercised by the Lord Lieutenant, it was to be exercised Constitutionally by the Lord Lieutenant on the advice of the Irish Ministers. We claim, therefore, that in purely Irish affairs we shall have full and supreme control. We, of course, shall be always subject to the supremacy of this Parliament, which at any time can come in and take our Constitution; but we shall not be subjected at any time to interference or amendment or revision of particular Acts. And we claim that the right of veto shall be exercised on the advice of the Irish Ministers, and that the Irish Parliament shall have power to deal with the question of land, with the police, and with the appointment of the magistrates. There is one portion of the Home Rule scheme which, when we come to discuss it in this House, will probably prove the *cruz* of the whole business. I mean the financial portion of it. But it would be manifestly absurd for me, on an occasion such as this, to enter into that. All I will say is that the financial portion of the scheme of 1886 was never accepted by the late Mr. Parnell, who

always made a reservation to the effect that he would endeavour in Committee to deal with and amend it. Further than that, I believe the experience of the last six years has convinced many men that the financial arrangements proposed in the Bill of 1886 were unjust to Ireland, and would probably, if passed into law, have resulted in the bankruptcy of the country before many years had elapsed. But, Mr. Speaker, I desire now to pass to another question. I deeply regret that there has been no statement made on the points I have mentioned, and I sincerely hope before the Debate ends we shall have not vague but specific and clear assurances as to these matters. I also regret that there seems to be an idea abroad that Parliament is to be prorogued until January or February next. I could understand a claim made by right hon. Gentlemen on the ground that they desire still further time for consulting with Irishmen and amongst themselves as to the details of the Home Rule Bill, but there is another question altogether which could be dealt with effectually in a Winter Session, and which is of so urgent a character that, for my part, I cannot understand how right hon. Gentlemen who are going to be responsible for the administration of the law in Ireland can allow it to remain in abeyance till the beginning of next year. Mr. Speaker there are now—and I state it on the authority of gentlemen who speak with some weight on these matters—there are now in Ireland about 5,000 evicted tenants and their families. I am told that the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy), whose speech I was unfortunate enough to miss, made a suggestion that the time between now and January or February could be well occupied by instituting an inquiry into the case of the evicted tenants. Now, it seems to me, very little inquiry is needed. Right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench, and the whole of the Liberal Party in this House, voted in favour of the Bill of last Session introduced by my friend Mr. O'Kelly, the late Member for North Roscommon, which proposed to give the Land Commission

*Mr. John Redmond*

power to compel landlords to sell to the old tenants farms from which they had been evicted at a price to be fixed by the Land Commission, and it gave power to the Land Commission to take the class called "planters"—there are not very many of them I am happy to say—by the back of the neck and put them out and the old tenants in. (Laughter.) Well, I do not sympathise with that laugh. That Bill was drafted by myself and some of my friends here. It was introduced by my friend Mr. O'Kelly, and supported by every Irish Member sitting for a Nationalist constituency, and by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian and the whole of the Liberal Party. And, for my own part, I do not see what need there is for a period extending from August until January or February for an inquiry into this matter. Surely the facts are sufficiently well known. Surely the right hon. Gentleman and the other Members of the Liberal Party who voted in favour of that Bill knew what they were doing and meant what their walking into the Lobby conveyed to the Irish people. Their supporters in Ireland had been prodigal with promises that as soon as the Liberal Party returned to power these poor people would be restored to their homes. Means have been found for doing so by my friend Mr. O'Kelly which have commended themselves to the wisdom of the Leaders of the Liberal Party, and, I ask, why not assemble Parliament in November and pass that Bill into law, and thus save Ireland and those tenants, and respectfully, I would say, save yourselves, from the situation you will be face to face with when you go to Ireland and have to explain to these tenants, who possibly may be starving, that they must wait till next January or February before you can do anything—that the months must be taken up by an inquiry, although you yourselves admitted last year that we had devised a plan you considered wise and just, and which should be carried into law. I would, therefore, earnestly impress upon the Liberal Party and their Leaders the desirability of summoning an Autumn Session of Parliament—it need not be a very long one—to pass into law a

Bill which will enable those tenants to be put back into their homes before the winter sets in in Ireland. Now there is just one other question on which I have to touch. It is the question of amnesty to the prisoners who are suffering under sentence of penal servitude. All the eighteen men in prison to whom I allude were convicted of Fenianism under the Treason Felony Act which you passed in order to imprison John Mitchel in the year 1848, and therefore they are men who come within the category of political prisoners. The House will remember the steps which have been taken on this question already. The movement in favour of their release was started in Ireland by Mr. Parnell. The first mention of the question of amnesty in this House was when, acting on the advice and under the guidance of Mr. Parnell, I believe the Session before last, I moved a Motion here in favour of their release. I am sorry to say that Motion did not lead to any very great results. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary opposed a firm and obdurate front to our appeals, and I regret to say he was seconded and supported by the late Home Secretary, the right hon. Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt). I then appealed to the Home Secretary for permission to investigate the legal aspects of these cases, and to visit those prisoners; and with a fairness—I had almost said a generosity—which certainly I will be the last to deny, the right hon. Gentleman gave me time after time facilities for visiting privately the principal of these prisoners in Portland Gaol, and I satisfied myself of certain aspects of the case, and last Session I again moved a Motion praying that there might be an investigation of some of these cases; and the result of the second Debate initiated by me was that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary admitted that in the case of one of those men, James Egan, there was a well-marked distinction, and that it was a case which might fairly come up for reconsideration and review at an early date. But, Mr. Speaker, the months have gone by and James Egan is still in Portland Prison. Is it too much to expect that the right

hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, before he leaves Office, will do at least one gracious act which would be remembered; is it too much to expect that in the case of this man, where it is practically admitted that the facts are such that he should be released—under these circumstances, is it too much to expect that the Home Secretary will boldly grapple with this case and release him? But whether he does or not, in this, as in everything else, we have been taught to look to his successors, and, for my own part, I cannot sit down without making a formal and definite appeal to them now. They are in Opposition at present, I know. But the very moment they take Office it will be the business of myself and of my hon. Friends to urge upon them the desirability of having a prompt and thorough investigation into the cases of these men with a view to their release. And more than that, we will press upon them that, apart altogether from the irregularity of the convictions and the unsoundness of the nature of the evidence on which they were convicted, we strongly hold the opinion that they who are pledged to the great policy of reconciliation in Ireland—who are pledged to the policy that is to heal all old sores and bury many fathoms deep bitter memories of strife between the two countries, that they ought to accompany any measure to carry out that policy with a measure of forgiveness to those men who, however much they may have erred were animated by a patriotic desire to serve their country. Mr. Speaker, this Debate should not close without allusion being made by both the Front Benches to this question. I appeal to the Government, while in Office, to release Egan. I appeal to the Government going into power to deal generously with this question. All I have to say to them is this: I have raised these points because I believe it is for the advantage, not only of the Liberal Party, but for the advantage of this country, as well as of Ireland, that there should be no longer any doubt or anxiety or uncertainty upon these questions. I said at the commencement that I, for my part, desire a perfectly free chance should be given to Liberal statesmen to fulfil



their promises to Ireland. But, at the same time, there is no use for the Liberal Party to be living in a fool's paradise. We Irish Members, Mr. Speaker, by our votes are going to place the Liberal Party in power; but unless the Liberal Party stand by their pledge that Ireland blocks the way—unless the Liberal Party stand by their pledge to propose a full and satisfactory Home Rule Bill—unless the Liberal Party stand by their pledge to take an early opportunity to deal in a spirit of broad-mindedness and generosity with the case of these prisoners, they must know that they cannot count on the continued support of Ireland. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian devotes his genius to this Irish problem, and insists upon his Party formally adhering to their pledges to Ireland, he will be taking a course which, in my humble judgment, will not merely redound to his own eternal honour, but which will redound also to the credit of the Liberal Party, to the honour of England, to the purity of her laws, and to the stability of her Empire.

(11.25.) VISCOUNT WOLMER (Edinburgh, W.): If the speech of the hon. Member who has just sat down has done nothing else, Mr. Speaker, it has, to a certain extent, answered the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith). My hon. Friend the Member for East Fife, after a preliminary reference to epitaphs—a study which I recommend him to keep up, as he may require some in a not far distant period—turned to the demand of the Proposer and Seconder of the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, and said that the information which they demanded had nothing whatever to do with the subject-matter now before us. But, I think, no one could have listened to the speech either of the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond) or of the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy) without feeling that at least those hon. Members did not see there was no occasion for information. What is the position that has

*Mr. John Redmond*

been taken up by the Gladstonians in the constituencies? They have demanded the suffrages of the electors on all grounds—the ground of general policy and the ground of Home Rule. About their general policy which they had no hope of carrying into law, they have been profuse in detail and lavish in promise. Many of them have gone to the extent—following the lead of the right hon. Member for the Bridgeton Division of Glasgow (Sir George Trevelyan)—of promising the atmosphere of a new heaven and a new earth. But as regards Home Rule, the watchword of the Party, from their Leader downwards, has been secrecy and concealment. They have pretended to trust the people of this country. They have said "We alone trust the people," and yet not one single item has a single Gladstonian told the electors as to what the Home Rule Bill is to be. I defy anyone to say that the Leader of the Gladstonian Party has taken the country into his confidence. There are individuals here and there who acted differently, and I do not wish to misrepresent them. But judging the Party by their spokesman, I defy contradiction when I say that while crying aloud to heaven and earth as the only man who trusts the people he has carefully concealed from them the whole of his political policy. Now what position do you find yourselves in? You have the demand of the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy) for precedence for Home Rule. He demands information about the evicted tenants, and he has made demands also with respect to the Crimes Act and Irish Administration. The hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond) not only endorses what he says, but endorses it in language more powerful than has ever before been heard in this House on the same subject. What has he demanded? He says that the Imperial Parliament, which was to be supreme, is not to have the power to deal with a single act of the Irish Parliament. Has any Irish Member, whether he be a Clerical or a Parnellite, expressed his dissent from that proposition? Not one. Has a single Gladstonian Member from England or Scotland expressed his

assent to that proposition? What materials for a homogeneous Party! An absolutely unanimous demand is put forward for an Irish Parliament whose acts shall not be vetoed—is there a single Scotch or English Home Ruler who put in his address or said to his constituents that he will vote for a Bill of that kind? Is there a single gentleman sitting near me who put in his address the statement that the acts of an Irish Parliament cannot and ought not to be vetoed by the Imperial Parliament? He has endeavoured to persuade the electors to vote for him as a Home Ruler because he is in favour of the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament; and here on the first day of the new Parliament he is face to face with this position that, whether he likes it or not, the day will come when all the promises he and his Party have made will have to be presented for payment, and the paymasters are those who will demand their presentation at the right moment. It is a position from which you have no escape. Either you have a majority or you have not. If you keep your majority you can only keep it by voting for that which every one of you pledged himself not to do. (“No.”) Has any hon. Member pledged himself to a Home Rule which means the granting of an Irish Parliament beyond the control of the Imperial Parliament in regard to its acts? Not one. And yet you have the whole of the Irish Members here unitedly demanding that as their only and sole condition. The hon. Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith), in the latter portion of his speech, protested against and denounced what he called the disintegrating doctrines of those who are putting forward the English vote as against the Irish vote. I should entirely agree with his protest in so far as it affected any ordinary measure before the country. But I ask the House to consider very carefully what it is which the hon. Member for East Fife now asks and is supported in his demand by those who agree with him. He says that, although England by an overwhelming majority, and Great Britain by a less majority, has pronounced against Home Rule, yet Home

Rule ought to be passed. Now, how was the Act of Union carried?

An hon. MEMBER: By bribery.

VISCOUNT WOLMER: It was carried by a great deal of bribery, which, I am sorry to say, was the common weapon in Parliamentary warfare both in England and in Ireland at that time; but it was passed with the assent of the only two bodies entitled to give their assent on behalf of Ireland and of Great Britain. It was passed with the assent of the Irish Parliament and of the British Parliament. The proposal now is that Home Rule should be passed with the assent of the Irish nation only. (“Oh!”) Is it denied that the English nation are against Home Rule? Not only is it proposed to undo, without the consent of one of the contracting parties, that which was done by the official representatives of the two contracting parties at the time, but, after repealing the Union and passing Home Rule against the wish of the English people, it is calmly proposed by the hon. Member for East Fife to leave here in this Parliament Irish Members to continue to outvote and to control English public opinion. I appeal to the House whether I have overstated the case?

An hon. MEMBER: The Irish Members are not to control English affairs.

VISCOUNT WOLMER: That is not the position of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian or of the Members who support him. It is not the position of any hon. Member near me. It is not the position of any of the Gladstonian Press—the *Daily News*, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the *Leeds Mercury*, or of any other of the Gladstonian papers. One and all of these now say that the Irish Members are to remain here to share in the full functions of a Member of Parliament. (“No!” and “Yes!”) The mere fact that on one side of me I hear “No” and on the other side “Yes” is an additional and distinct proof of the perfect homogeneity of this Party. I do not think I am wrong in saying that it

is absolutely preposterous to give Ireland Home Rule in the sense Irish Members demand, and to leave Irish Members here to rule England, Scotland, and Wales. It is a proposition which I do not believe any Member of Parliament, whatever his politics may be, will dare to face his constituents with as a supporter of, and it is quite certain the Unionist Party will be false to its first trust and duty if it did not resist any such proposal with every Parliamentary form and with the whole energy in its power. I have only one thing more to say. The hon. Member for East Fife was kind enough, in the concluding portion of his speech, to cheer himself with some scornful remarks about the dwindling numbers of the Liberal Unionist Party. He said—I believe with strict mathematical accuracy—that in 1886 we were ninety-four, and that at the present moment we have been returned as forty-seven; and he also said that it required no great skill in arithmetic to predict how long it would be before that forty-seven disappeared. Now the only complaint I have to make against that statement is that it was not quite full enough. I should like to add to it what the Liberal Unionist Party has done in the period in question. Six years ago the majority that followed Mr. Gladstone, added to the Irish Members, was 160, at the present moment the majority in Mr. Gladstone's favour is forty. Therefore it has taken the Liberal Unionist Party six years, at a loss of forty-seven seats, to reduce the right hon. Member's majority from 160 to forty. I shall be quite content if, at the end of another six years, the majority is again reduced at the same proportions. It would give a good Unionist majority of eighty. When that is done the work of the Liberal Unionist Party is done, and

*Viscount Wolmer*

there will be no further need for its continuance. The Liberal Unionist Party came into existence to do certain work. They have done half of it, and they intend to do the rest. But the reason why the Liberal Unionist Party are not so very dear to some of my hon. Friends around me is because they have been very much stronger than my friends around me expected, for not only have they held together in this House and when threatened with extinction come back to the number of forty-seven, but they have, by their influence in the constituencies, turned a majority of 160 into one of a bare and homogeneous forty. It is thought by some ardent Home Rulers that this victory marks the end of their labours and is the triumph of their work. It is only the beginning of the contest for us. It is the first time since 1886 we have been able to come face to face with the men we oppose on this question with all the conscientious strength of our natures. We are in earnest in this matter, and you will find us so. I venture to predict that not in this Parliament alone but in future Parliaments will the Liberal Unionists be there to do the work they have to do until that work is done. The advantage we have over you is this—that whereas you are not united we are united; whereas you do not really know your minds we have made up ours, and whereas you are prepared to compromise we never will.

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
 "That the Debate be now adjourned."  
 —(*Mr. Leveson Gower.*)

Motion agreed to.

Debate adjourned till To-morrow.

House adjourned at a quarter before  
 Twelve o'clock.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Tuesday, 9th August, 1892.*

The Marquess of Dufferin and Ava—  
Took the Oath.

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER  
CONFIRMATION BILLS.

Ordered, That the Orders of the 21st of June last for the suspension of Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills be held applicable to the next Session of Parliament.

House adjourned at One o'clock, to Monday  
next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Tuesday, 9th August, 1892.*

The House met at Three of the  
clock.

Several other Members took and  
subscribed the Oath; and one other  
Member made and subscribed the  
Affirmation required by Law.

## PRIVATE BUSINESS.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

(3.20.) MR. L. H. COURTNEY  
(Cornwall, Bodmin): It will be in the  
remembrance of some Members of the  
House who were also in the last Parlia-  
ment that on the 20th of June I moved  
a series of Resolutions having the effect  
of enabling Private Bills which had not  
passed both Houses to be suspended at  
the stage they reached immediately  
before the Dissolution, and to be re-  
sumed at the same stage in the present  
Session. But I thought it necessary to  
say then that though in doing so I  
followed the precedents of 1880 and  
1885 the circumstances of the Session  
were so different from those on the former  
occasions that I scarcely anticipated

that similar results would follow to  
those which followed the passing of  
those Resolutions in the years I men-  
tioned. In 1880, it will be remem-  
bered, the Dissolution occurred at  
Easter, and half the Sessional work  
remained to be done, and there was  
abundant opportunity for discharging  
the Private Bill work during the re-  
newed Session. In 1886, though the  
Dissolution came later in the year,  
there remained a large proportion of  
the work of Supply to be discharged,  
hon. Members had to be in constant  
attendance, and so it was an easy  
matter to find Members to complete  
the Committee work upon Private  
Bills. But, as I said in June last it  
would be, it is difficult to take up in  
the present Session any of the work  
upon Private Bills left over from last  
Session, and therefore those engaged in  
the work did their utmost to carry  
Bills to their last stage. My anticipa-  
tions have been realised, and it is found  
absolutely impossible to resume any  
part of the work left over. I have,  
therefore, now to move the Motion of  
which I have given notice, which will  
have the effect of carrying forward the  
Resolutions passed in June to the  
commencement of next Session, so that  
then it will be possible to take up the  
Bills at the stage at which they were  
incomplete at the close of the last Par-  
liament. It is with great reluctance  
the conclusion has been arrived at, and  
it is a disappointment to the promoters  
of the suspended Bills, but examination  
has shown most clearly that it is prac-  
tically impossible to take any stage of  
an opposed Bill during the present  
Session. It is difficult to get Members  
of this House or of the other House  
to attend to these details, the  
exigencies of the time and the period  
required preclude all hope of carrying  
the Bills forward. Therefore I move  
the Resolution which will enable the  
Bills to be resumed and the work com-  
pleted next Session.

Motion made, and Question pro-  
posed,

"That the Standing Orders of the 20th  
June last for the suspension of Private Bills,  
or Bills to confirm any Provisional Order or  
Certificate, be now read, and that the same  
be held applicable to the next Session of  
Parliament."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

MR. TIMOTHY HEALY (Louth, N.): May I ask the late Chairman of Committees whether in the House of Lords a similar Resolution will be passed? There are some Irish Bills in the other House in which we take great interest.

MR. COURTNEY: Such a Resolution has been passed this morning.

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Standing Orders of the 20th June last for the suspension of Private Bills, or Bills to confirm any Provisional Order or Certificate, be now read, and that the same be held applicable to the next Session of Parliament.—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

#### CONTROVERTED ELECTION (GREENOCK).

\*MR. SPEAKER acquainted the House that he had received the following Letter:—

"No. 7, H.M. New General Register House,  
Edinburgh, 8 August, 1892.

To the Right Honble. the Speaker  
of the House of Commons, London.  
Greenock Election.

Sir,

As directed by the Judges for the trial of Election Petitions in Scotland, I have the honour to transmit to you the enclosed Certificate, and to remain,

Your obedient Servant,  
C. TENNANT COUPER,  
Principal Clerk of Session.

We, Andrew Rutherford Clark (Lord Rutherford Clark) and James Adam (Lord Adam), being two of the Judges on the rota for the trial of election Petitions, hereby Certify to the Right Honourable The Speaker of the House of Commons, That, in a Court held by us at Edinburgh, on eighth August, Eighteen hundred and ninety-two, for the trial of the election Petition of Sir Thomas Sutherland, K.C.M.G., of Bute House, Cromwell Road, London, Shipowner, and others, claiming that the said Sir Thomas Sutherland had been duly elected as Member of Parliament for the Burgh of Greenock, at he election on fourth July, Eighteen hundred and ninety-two, found and determined that the return of John Bruce, of Yonderton, Aberdeenshire, and Pump Court, Temple, London, Barrister-at-Law, as Member of Parliament for the said Burgh of Greenock, was an undue return within the meaning of the Act 31 and 32 Victoria, caput 125, Section 5, and that the Petitioner, the said

Sir Thomas Sutherland, was duly elected, and ought to have been returned as Member for the said Burgh.

Given under our hands at Edinburgh, the eighth day of August, Eighteen hundred and ninety-two,

AND. R. CLARK,  
Lord Rutherford Clark.  
JAMES ADAM,  
Lord Adam.

Ordered, That the Clerk of the Crown do attend this House forthwith with the last Return for the said Burgh of Greenock, and amend the same by striking out the name of John Bruce, esquire, and inserting the name of Sir Thomas Sutherland, K.C.M.G.

The Clerk of the Crown attending, amended the Return accordingly.

#### QUESTIONS.

##### CIVIL SERVANTS AND ELECTIONS.

MR. S. WOODS (Lancashire, S.W., Ince): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether the Chairman and Secretary of the Post Office Servants' Trade Union, who were dismissed for circulating a series of questions to Parliamentary candidates during the recent election, were the only offenders in this respect among the Post Office officials; and, if not, why they alone were selected for punishment; and which law or regulation have the men in question violated to justify their instant dismissal?

\*MR. H. P. COBB (Warwick, S.E., Rugby) had notice of the following question:—To ask the Postmaster General, with regard to the case of Messieurs Clery and Cheesman, sorters in the Post Office, who were recently dismissed for having, as Chairman and Secretary of the Fawcett Association, addressed a letter to Parliamentary candidates asking whether they would support a Motion for the appointment of a Committee of Inquiry into the Post Office, such as was advocated by the noble Lord the Member for the Barnsley Division (Earl Compton) and largely supported during a recent Session, and also with regard to the fact that, on the 14th of June, he publicly expressed his sense of the impropriety of Post Office servants endeavouring on the eve of a General Election to extract promises from can-

didates to support a Motion for a Parliamentary Inquiry, and on the 17th of June, in a special edition of the *Post Office Circular*, warned Post Office servants that it would be improper for them, whether in combination or individually, to endeavour to extract promises from Parliamentary candidates with reference to their duties and pay, whether he has taken or will take the opinion of the Law Officers as to the legality of his action in interfering with the right of Post Office servants, in common with other citizens, to urge their views upon and to ask for pledges from Parliamentary candidates; whether he has received any intimation or is aware that his statement and warning have caused grave dissatisfaction and alarm among employees in all branches of the Civil Service; whether he can name any precedent for the course he has taken in issuing the warning and in dismissing Messieurs Clery and Cheesman; and whether he proposes to reinstate them and to withdraw the warning?

\*THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir JAMES FERGUSON, Manchester, N.E.): I would ask leave to reply at the same time to the question in the name of the hon. Member for Rugby. In reply to the first question, the two men dismissed were not the only offenders, but they were certainly the ringleaders, and so were made chiefly responsible. I do not see any occasion to ask for the Law Officers' opinion as to the legality of my action in the cases mentioned. I do not know if the hon. Member is aware that when the Bill for the removal of the Electoral Disabilities of Revenue Officers was in Committee of the Whole House, in 1874, the Bill was amended with unanimous approval with the express object of enabling the Heads of Departments to make such regulations as they might deem expedient in regard to the interference of such officers in elections. The recent occasion appeared to me to be one in which some directions were necessary in the public interest, and I distinctly pointed out the necessity upon the Post Office Vote. I am not aware that my statement and warning have caused grave dissatisfaction and alarm in the Civil Service, nor am I aware of any precedent either

for the course I have taken or for the conduct which led to it, and I do not propose to reinstate the dismissed men or to withdraw the warning.

\*MR. COBB: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, is there not a distinct difference between interfering in an election and in simply asking the man who aspires to be your representative whether he will do certain things in your interest? As I am now up, may I also ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that officers in high positions in the Inland Revenue Department, immediately previous to and during the elections, did send circulars to candidates asking what action they would be prepared to take on certain points affecting the interests of those officers? I would also ask why it is a greater offence for a man in a subordinate position—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is an argumentative question.

\*MR. COBB: I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is a greater offence for a man in a subordinate position in a Government Office to ask a question—

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a question to ask at Question time. The hon. Member is putting an argument in the form of a question; he may ask a question on a matter of fact.

\*MR. COBB: I shall be glad if the right hon. Gentleman can answer the questions I have put to him.

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSON: Of course there are various kinds of interference, and some of them may be more improper than others. There have always been these regulations since 1874 checking certain practices on the part of Post Office servants, and recent occasions seem to indicate that some further regulation is required. I thought this was an improper kind of interference. I am not aware of the practice alleged to have taken place in another Department to which the hon. Member has referred.

MR. TIMOTHY HEALY (Louth, N.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman why did he delay the announcement of the punishment of these officers until the General Election was over?

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: I do not think the General Election was over when I took the first step in the matter. At all events, I dealt with the matter on the first day after my arrival in London, when the case was reported to me.

#### THE DISTURBANCES IN UGANDA.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if all Papers received from Uganda have been published; if either Captain Lugard or Captain Williams, or both, are to be recalled; and what steps are being taken to ensure protection to Catholic missionaries and Catholic converts in Uganda?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): Papers are about to be laid giving the information received by Her Majesty's Government since that already published in Africa No. 4, 1892. It is understood that the Imperial British East Africa Company have sent instructions for all their officers now in Uganda to withdraw on the 31st of December next. It appears from letters from Protestant Missionaries, dated up to the 3rd of May, that Captain Lugard has consented to a division of territory by which the armed French Catholics shall stay in Buddu, while in Uganda all religions shall be free. A mail has just reached this country containing further Reports from Captain Lugard to the British East Africa Company, but they have not yet been received at the Foreign Office, and it is therefore not proposed to delay the issue of the Blue Book until they are received.

#### THE GALWAY AND CLIFDEN RAILWAY.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if a large number of workmen on the Galway and Clifden Railroad are left with their wages unpaid; and if he will take such steps as will ensure the payment of their wages, either by refusing his consent to the time for the completion of the railroad being extended unless the wages are paid, or otherwise?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I have no official information, but I have seen the statement that owing to the fault of the contractor some workmen employed by the Midland Great Western Railway Company were left unpaid. I gather from a statement recently made before the Privy Council that this state of things was remedied by the Company making the payment.

COLONEL NOLAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman sure of that, or was it only a third of the amount paid?

\*MR. JACKSON: As I have said, I have no official information, and I have had no time since notice of the question was given to make inquiry; but I understand the statement was made that the Company had undertaken to see that the wages were paid, and had forwarded the funds for the purpose.

#### THE TUBERCULOSIS COMMISSION.

MR. WILLIAM FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick's): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the Report of the Tuberculosis Commission has been received, or when it may be expected; and is the destruction of animals, without compensation to the owner, to continue when the animals have been purchased in public market under the supervision of a Governmental veterinary surgeon inspector, but subsequently condemned by another authority?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. H. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): No, Sir; the Report of the Tuberculosis Commission has not been received, but I am informed by the Secretary to the Commission that the experiments undertaken are rapidly approaching termination, and that a number of valuable facts have been conclusively proved. There is still, however, a large amount of material to be examined microscopically, and it may be necessary to further examine scientific witnesses. For this reason it is impossible to fix with precision the date of the conclusion of the inquiry. In reply to the second paragraph of the hon. Member's question, I have to say that he is in error in supposing that animals can be destroyed by any public authority in consequence of being affected with

tuberculosis, and that such animals are purchased in public market under the supervision of a Governmental veterinary surgeon.

#### THE PRISONER EGAN.

MR. T. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has yet re-considered the case of the prisoner Egan, at present in Portland Prison; and whether he can hold out hopes of his speedy release?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): The answer to the first paragraph of the question is in the affirmative, and to the second I have to reply in the negative.

#### NEW METROPOLITAN FEVER HOSPITAL.

MR. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Local Government Board have received information from the Metropolitan Asylums Board of their intention of erecting a new fever hospital; whether he is aware that the Metropolitan Asylums Board proposes to place that hospital on a site separated only by a railway embankment from a population of 4,000 working people, and on low-lying ground in a neighbourhood frequently flooded by reason of the discharge of surface water; and whether, seeing that there is available ground not open to these objections within a distance of two miles, the Local Government Board will refuse their sanction to the erection of the hospital on the proposed site? In putting this question I apologise to the right hon. Gentleman for troubling him, but I do so in consequence of there being no representative of the Local Government Board here.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have communicated with my right hon. Friend on the subject by telegraph, and I have not yet received an answer. If the hon. Member will be good enough to put his question down for Thursday I have little doubt that then I shall be able to give him an answer.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman further communicate with the President of the Local Government Board to secure to the inhabitants of the district further time to allow them to make full representation to the Local Government Board as to the comparative advantages of the sites before the scheme is carried out?

MR. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman will give me his question, or put it on the Paper, I will endeavour to obtain the information he desires.

#### RICHMOND PRISON, DUBLIN.

MR. TIMOTHY HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cause of the delay in presenting the Return, ordered 20th June, respecting the expenditure on Richmond Prison, now a barrack, to the ratepayers of Dublin?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): The expenditure upon Richmond Prison by the Dublin Corporation, the former prison authority, was to have been ascertained by the War Office. I have communicated with that Department asking why the information has not been supplied, and I gather that, though notice was given, the Return, for some cause or other, was missed on the last day of the Session. As to the other expenditure by the Prisons Board, a Return has been sent to the printers, and it will shortly be in the hands of hon. Members.

MR. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman have the whole information included in one Return?

\*MR. JACKSON: The difficulty is that the one Return for which the Irish Office is responsible has already been sent to the printers. It will be necessary to move for a Return of the other portion.

MR. HEALY: That I suppose will be done before the right hon. Gentleman goes out of office?

#### ADJOURNMENT.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I beg to give notice that on Thursday I propose to move the sus-



pension of the Twelve o'clock Rule, not with the view of prolonging the Debate, but in order to insure that the arrangement which has been arrived at for taking a Division on that day may not be interfered with. I now beg to move—"That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday."

Motion agreed to.

Resolved, "That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday."

### ORDER OF THE DAY

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

[ADJOURNED DEBATE.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [8th August], "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, as followeth:—

'MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal Subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled, beg leave to thank Your Majesty for the most Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Barton.*)

And which Amendment was,

At the end of the Question, to add the words "That we feel it, however, to be our duty humbly to submit to Your Majesty that it is essential that Your Majesty's Government should possess the confidence of this House and of the Country, and respectfully to represent to Your Majesty that such confidence is not reposed in the present Advisers of Your Majesty."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate resumed.

(3.43.) MR. W. E. GLADSTONE (Edinburgh, Midlothian): I conceive that we are engaged in a Debate one of the most singular, in many of its features, that is to be found among the records of this House. In the first place, in regard to the method of procedure which has been adopted; Her Majesty's Government being, as has happened to former Governments, seriously in question as to their existence

and the approval of their policy after the result of a General Election, had before them two descriptions of precedents which it was in their power to examine, and either of which they could have followed. One of these was the class of procedure represented by the course taken by the Government in 1841 and again in 1859, and on both of these occasions what proved to be the outgoing Government did not resign on being aware of the result of a General Election, but incurred the delay of meeting Parliament, with the view, apparently, of setting forth in a Queen's Speech the scheme of policy upon which they wished to stand. One sees, of course, the advantage of the course then pursued, and the disadvantage is, of course, the delay in public business. But in 1868 a different course was adopted by the judgment—as I think, the sound and manly judgment—of Lord Beaconsfield. Being aware that he was in the predicament likely to issue in the loss of his Ministerial position, he, without incurring any of the delay caused by meeting Parliament and going through the form of a Debate on the Motion of Want of Confidence, resigned at once. The convenience of that precedent was so much recognised that it was followed by the Liberal Government in 1874, by the Conservative Government in 1880, and again by the Liberal Government in 1886. It may be said that in this convenient course there is the disadvantage involved, that the country, when the Government disappeared, was not put in full possession of its prospective intentions. Well, Sir, this may have been a disadvantage; in the one class of cases that advantage was gained; in the other class of cases a great deal of public time was saved. But Her Majesty's Government have not thought fit to follow the one class of precedent or the other, but they have adopted a course which includes the disadvantage of each. They have incurred the delay which is consequent on this mode of proceeding, but they have made no communication of policy to the House; they have supplied no material for debate in respect to their prospective intentions, and they have struck out for themselves a third course of proceeding, in respect

*Mr. A. J. Baijour*

to which I cannot perceive that it possesses any recommendation except that it is a novelty, without any advantage whatever attending on its adoption. So much for the method of the procedure upon which we are now engaged. There are other and more serious matters which have to be observed, but certainly I would note, with reference to the future, that I think, considering the weight and the almost unbroken continuity of these four precedents to which I have referred, I cannot help hoping that course will be pursued, and that the House will not find itself embarked in a Debate so singular, so anomalous, so barren, as this Debate in which we are now engaged. When we go a little further into the matter we come to the root of the argument, which was explained in a manner that leaves nothing to be desired in the admirable, able, speech of my hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Asquith). We have met to decide what is the *res acta* and the *res judicata*. There is a recognised tribunal of appeal. It is admitted that, when the condition of the country and the condition of its Ministry and the policy of that Ministry are submitted to the country at a General Election, the result of that Election is binding and conclusive. Well, Sir, upon all evidence recognised in such cases, and which was recognised in each of the four instances I have quoted, we have gone through that process in full, and notwithstanding that we have gone through that process we are here met to discuss—we hardly know what. We know, indeed, what is meant by the Amendment to the Address, because that Amendment calls upon us to recognise and to record the decision of the country; but what is meant by the Motion made to intercept, to prevent, or delay the adoption of that Amendment I know not, and it has not yet been explained. Is it or is it not a fact that the judgment of the nation is a judgment without appeal? If it is a judgment without appeal, on what duty are we now engaged? Is it possible that it can be conceived by the occupants of the Treasury Bench that this is a suitable and fitting occasion for fighting through all the battles of the last six years? But if not, what are we now debating? If

we were to fight those battles through with what object or with what issue could it possibly be done? Certainly those battles, whatever else may be said of them, were sufficient in number, in importance, in intensity, and in continuity of purpose to place the country in full possession of the situation of parties and of policy. The country never had such opportunities, I believe, of comprehending the issues before it. I have known many cases—there has been the case of Reform, and the case of Protection—but never was there an issue, a great issue, submitted to the country which was so fully, so largely, so diversely, so exhaustively discussed as the issue which has been before the country during the last General Election. The Government are perfectly aware of this. They know quite well that a majority have come to this House prepared to give effect to the verdict of their constituents, and they could not do otherwise. The deliberative part of the process was disposed of in the last Parliament, and by the General Election. We on this side of the House solicited the judgment of our constituents on certain grounds; those grounds, stated and recommended by us, were approved by them, and having been approved by them, what is it the Government have to urge in reply? Are we to have a detailed defence of the whole policy of the Government, of the measures they have passed, of their reasons for refusing to pass other measures, and of the administrative system they have pursued? Sir, it is too late for such a defence. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House is aware that if his lips distilled all the honey of Nestor, if his voice were clothed with all the thunders of Jove, still this is a settled and determined question, and a Debate interposed upon the merits of the case—if it is to be on the merits of the case—would, in my judgment, have no more propriety and no more meaning than if, on an ordinary occasion, after you had delivered the judgment of the House from that Chair, a Division being challenged, and you, Sir, had stopped all further discussion, an attempt were made to re-open and renew the whole matter of the Debate. Now, that is not only my opinion, it is

an opinion entirely supported and made good by the speech we heard last night from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. What was the purport of that speech? Did it contain a word in defence of the Government? No, it was entirely an impeachment of some Government that has not been formed, which is to exist in the future. The right hon. Gentleman suffered judgment to pass against him in default, and occupied time in a manner which is called academic in character, in a manner more fitted to a Debating Society, as it appears to me, than to this House, in debating what would be the position of a Government which might have to be formed on the retirement or withdrawal of the present Government, and what would be the merits of that Government. The right hon. Gentleman generally is known for his devotion to the use of what is called the *tu quoque* argument, but on this occasion that argument was deserted by my right hon. Friend altogether. It was impossible for him to make a speech of objection and accusation by way of *tu quoque*, or in any other manner, to a Government not yet called into existence, that has done no act good or bad. What was the course taken by the right hon. Gentleman? He said in this case it is proposed to carry, as he anticipates, a measure of Home Rule by an Irish majority. He had been told by my hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Asquith) that the majority was no more Irish than it was Welsh or Scotch. He said it was proposed to carry such a measure by an Irish majority, and he did not explain why a distinction was to be drawn between the Irish votes in this House and the votes by Members from Wales or Scotland, nor did he meet the fundamental and conclusive objection taken by my hon. and learned Friend, that we have no title to distinguish between votes for the purpose of invalidating the authority of any decision at which this House may arrive; and to make such a distinction for the purpose of impairing in the slightest degree that full and plenary authority is really to strike at the root of the Constitution of the United Parliament and at the Constitution of the United Kingdom. But there is one sense in which I am not at all indisposed to recognise that it is an

Irish majority, and that is in the sense with which we are familiar in all the proceedings of this House. It has been recognised again and again, by the present Government and others also that in cases where one of the three Kingdoms, or one of the four Divisions of the country, has some strong and special interest, and where a large majority of the Representatives of that Division of the country have a decided opinion one way, and give forth the judgment of that portion of the country in a form that cannot be mistaken; it has been recognised, again and again, that such an incident, though of course it cannot have anything to do with adding to, or impairing, the authority of the regular vote, yet has been recognised as an element in favour of arriving at conclusions in consonance with the view expressed by the Representatives of that part of the country. That has been done by the present Government, and done, I think, with great propriety, in a rather remarkable instance, in the case of Welsh intermediate education. In the case of Wales a system of intermediate education was introduced, and rules and provisions were adopted for the purpose of giving effect to that system, very different from those prevailing in England, and adopted by the Government entirely, and, as I think, wisely, in deference to the general wish of the Representatives of Wales. Is it to be supposed that in the case of Scotland—although I admit, in the case of Scotland, it is quite true that the Government and the House have shown very insufficient acknowledgment of the wishes of the people of Scotland—but is it to be supposed that any hon. Member would venture to rise in this House and, in a case specially affecting the particular interests of Scotland, urge, as a reason why the wishes of Scotland should not be gratified, that the majority by means of which the vote would pass would be likely to consist in whole, or great part, of the Members from Scotland? No, Sir; the truth is that these observations about an Irish majority, are observations that, in deference to bad traditions, Gentlemen allow themselves to make in the case of Ireland, when they would not venture to make them in reference to any other part of the United Kingdom.

Mr. W. E. Gladstone

Ireland has undoubtedly—that cannot for a moment be denied—a great and special interest in the question of Home Rule; and if we are shown that great and special interest—far greater upon any showing of the case than Great Britain or than England—that is a reason why you should approach the consideration of the subject with favourable predispositions, and it is anything rather than a reason why you should allege a preponderance of Irish votes as ground for indisposition to the adoption of the measure. Therefore, if the majority is an Irish majority, that is a recommendation and not a disadvantage. This was one of the main arguments of my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. What was the course of argument he pursued? As I have said, he did not venture a word in defence of the proceedings of the present Government. I am not finding fault with him, because I fail to see how anything but a character of utter unreason could attach to our proceedings if we were to hold this as an occasion on which the merits of our discussions of the last six years were again to be urged on one side in argument and contested on the other. But my right hon. Friend, in his kindly and benevolent care for the fortunes of a coming Government, which, he supposes, may emerge into the light of day, was so kind that he began to observe upon the difficulty which that Government would experience. There is an hon. Member in the House who has declared that he does not repose his confidence in the right hon. Member for Midlothian. That may be so. And that hon. Gentleman I have been told—I am not of his intimate acquaintance—also says that he is very strongly against the continuance in Office of the present Government. If so, and if he does not repose his confidence in any other Government—if he unhappily finds himself in that unfortunate predicament—no doubt he will find opportunities of saying so, and of voting accordingly. But while we have to decide for to-day the question of confidence in the existing Government, Her Majesty's Advisers entirely leap over that subject of debate, dive far into the future, and substitute for that

issue the merits of a future Government, whose demerits they assume and whose demerits they allege as the sole ground why they are to be continued in Office. He also says that there are a section of Irish Members who he believes will not support the coming Government. I do not find fault with the right hon. Gentleman for the infelicity of his arguments; I do not think that he had any others at his command. He said there were a section of Irish Members who would not support the coming Government. However, that speech of my right hon. Friend was almost immediately followed by a speech from the Leader of that section, who at once declared that he joined in the condemnation of the present Government, and he declines to substitute for the question of the condemnation of the Government that now exists the question of the condemnation of a future Government, which, according to all the rules of common sense, as well as the rules of Parliamentary procedure, must be judged upon its acts and words when it has come into existence, and cannot possibly be judged while it remains a nebulous hypothesis. My right hon. Friend again appeared to be extremely well pleased when he said—"Ah, you have got a majority, but your majority is not all returned upon Home Rule. Some of them were returned upon the London question, and not upon the Irish question." Now, Sir, I believe my right hon. Friend had himself to admit, in the course of his speech, that whereas he had consulted a great number of Liberal election addresses he found that in some of them Home Rule was less prominently mentioned than in others. Well, I am not at all surprised at that. But what does it signify, supposing it were true—and in my opinion it is not—that a portion of Members had been returned to this House on one ground and a portion upon another ground. What would that signify in the view of the present question, as my right hon. Friend has to admit that they have all of them been returned for the purpose of putting a period to the existence of the present Government? Well, Sir, I never happened to hear in the course of my experience so singular a defence of an Administration which has been

put upon its trial for its life. But I own we are placed in a position of difficulty by the course which has been adopted on the opposite side of the House—that is to say, as I have contended, this matter being a subject that has been fully considered and decided by the country in conjunction with us, its Representatives, we are not in a condition to go back upon it with profit, with relevancy or propriety, and fight over again the battles in which we were so long engaged during the last Parliament. What, then, are we to do? Shall I re-state that argument? I will re-state the main grounds upon which I believe the country decided this great issue. Her Majesty's Government had been wont to speak of the success they had achieved in Ireland. We, Sir, deny that suggestion. We do not admit that the case ever existed in Ireland which they represented as existing. In my opinion, Ireland has been in a state of peace since the year 1884. The facts of the case are these, and cannot be altered: that in the years 1886 and 1887 there was an increase of a few hundreds in the number of agrarian offences; but that increase of a few hundreds did not represent a transition from a state of peace to a state of disturbance. It represented nothing of the kind. It represented that extreme pressure of agricultural distress. When that pressure occurred, Her Majesty's Government were urged and invoked and pressed by every means from this side of the House to meet it by a temporary provision while the inquiries were being made which were necessary to determine the question whether the people were able to pay their rents or not. Her Majesty's Government unfortunately turned a deaf ear to all those representations, and to the Bill of Mr. Parnell, and to the demands made that they should make some temporary provision or expedient that would enable us to tide over the difficulty. Then came a small increase in the number of agrarian offences, and that small increase was made the pretext for representing that the country was in a state of disturbance and for the introduction of a Coercion Bill which, according to our allegation, was never introduced or constructed at all for the purpose of repressing crime, but was a Bill

constructed for the purpose of collecting rents, by carrying into the province of criminal procedure that which properly belonged to civil procedure, by discountenancing and narrowing the application of trial by jury, and by substituting the administration of the law through a set of Judges whose decisions could not command respect, because they were known to be entirely dependent for the retention of their office upon the discretion of the Executive Government. On that question of the distress in Ireland, I must admit that great good was done by the Land Act of 1887; to the credit of that good Her Majesty's Government are entitled in all respects, except that it was fatally too late; because, undoubtedly, in consequence of their delays the country had been agitated, and what was called the Plan of Campaign had been established—a most unhappy and a most evil symptom of the social and political condition of the land. Yes, Sir, they did good by that Bill, and they did good by doing the very thing which, up to the moment of their doing it, they declared to be impossible on the ground that it was impolitic. Gentlemen are probably aware—and those who are not aware should be aware—that that was the ground upon which the Government declared in 1886 that it was impossible for them to interfere with the judicial rents established under the Land Act—that was the very thing which they did in 1887, and which, undoubtedly, did needful good to the country. The right hon. Gentleman did enter, undoubtedly, into grave conflict with the occupiers and cultivators of the land in Ireland on the subject of their relation with the landlords. They established a state of things against which he made war, and the cardinal condition of which was that the strong action of public opinion in Ireland, the moral opinion—I do not say now what description was given to it on the other side of the House; the question is not now a question of merits, but a question of success—a strong action of opinion was created in Ireland against the taking of the evicted farms, and upon that question of the taking of the evicted farms, not in one particular place like New Tipperary, which was

a special and exceptional development, but in the large number of counties where these evictions had taken place—the question whether these evicted farms were taken by *boni fide* tenants and again put into cultivation was a test to determine whether the repressive system of the Government had succeeded. We often called for a Return; we desired to know in what condition these farms were. All our information was to the effect that the very large majority of them have never been taken at all. And if that be so, that is of itself a proof of the total failure of this system of repression. Her Majesty's Government would never give us that information. With regard to their success, then, we do not admit it; we deny it. With regard to their system of governing Ireland by coercion, that is, indeed, a sad and painful subject. I will not enter into the details of it. We hold as strongly as any hon. Gentleman in this House the necessity of firm, just, and steady enforcement of the law in Ireland. It is a part of the dominions of the Queen, and it is one of our complaints, and the main complaint against this system of government, that it renders impossible that steady, firm, and consistent administration of the law, because you cannot have such a system of administration permanently established until you have brought the provisions of the law and the sympathies of the people into harmony. (A Laugh.) I see I do not convince the hon. Member (Colonel Saunderson). He is disposed to meet the establishment of such a proposition rather with ridicule. He is quite content, apparently, that the Government of Ireland should place the provisions of the law on one side and the sympathies of the nation on the other. We do not believe in that system of government. It is not the system upon which England, Scotland, and Wales are governed. Ireland ought to be governed on the same system as England, Scotland, and Wales. While we hold that opinion of the necessity of enforcing the law, we hold just as strongly the opinion that to enforce upon Ireland such an instrument of government as a permanent Coercion Act is not only a violation of the equality of civil rights between Englishmen and Irishmen, but is in the highest degree injurious to respect

for the law and for its administration. An appeal was made to me last night on this subject by my hon. Friend the Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy). Our opinion is, in respect to that Act, that it ought not to retain its place upon the Statute Book for a moment longer than is required by the condition of Parliamentary time. (Ironical Laughter.) I see that those Gentlemen are prepared to go further than I am, and think it is an Act which ought to be repealed at once, irrespective of Parliamentary time, and to the prejudice of other questions; but I cannot quite accompany them in these extreme views. With regard to the system of administration in Ireland, it was, as we conceived, open to every objection that can tell against a system of administration. It was inconsistent, and it varied in the most important particulars between the earlier and later portion of the period. It was conducted in an arbitrary spirit, and I could easily show this by reference to the arrest of Father McFadden on the charge of murder, and his subsequent release from prison without reparation or apology. It was marked, in our opinion, by gross instances of illegality. And, finally, I am obliged to say that the pretended reparation which was offered to Ireland, in the shape of the Local Government Bill, was, instead of being a reparation, one of the worst wrongs that have been inflicted on that country, for in that Bill, in the fourth clause, was contained a provision—noticed by us at the time in the Debates, and impossible to be denied—that all the schemes that were to be formed for local government by the County Councils, when they were established, were to be placed at the mercy of the Joint Committee, in which effectual provision had been made for the predominance of class interests; and having been so placed in their hands, they were to be altered, abbreviated, enlarged, and then published in the form of law as might seem good to that Joint Committee. These are, briefly stated, our reasons for disapproving entirely of the government of Ireland and denying its success. With regard to the better measures of the Government, when we found those which we could cordially support, we

gave that support; and I name with pleasure the measure of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the reduction of the National Debt. But with regard to these measures in general, what we had to complain of was this—that when the measures were good, they were so imperfect, and fell so far short of their necessary and legitimate purpose, that the late Parliament has bequeathed to the present Parliament a heavy task in the amendment of those measures to bring them into decent conformity with the objects they had in view. I need not do more than mention the omission of the great question of arrears from the Irish Land Act of 1887—the arrears so carefully included in the Crofters Act for Scotland, for Scotland could not be trifled with—the state of the English County Councils Act, the state of the Scotch County Councils Act, on which I think, in no less than twelve separate cases, the Scottish Members endeavoured to urge the claims of Scotland without the smallest effect—and many others; the useful measure of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Chaplin) for the creation and encouragement of small holdings, with respect to which he knows very well we consider that that measure is vitally maimed and defective until there is included in it compulsory power of taking land, and until Parish Councils are established to give effect to its provisions. It is hardly necessary for us to remind the House, in reciting these grounds of objection to the policy of Her Majesty's present Government, that we made all the efforts which our limited command of the House's time would permit to bring forward measures of our own which are thought by the Liberal Party to be vital to the welfare of the country. For example, we tried to obtain the appointment of District Councils and Parish Councils, to place the police under the County Councils, to place the licensing under the County Councils, the adoption of local option, the application of principles of religious equality to the countries of Scotland and Wales, the shortening of Parliaments, the payment of Members, amendment of the system of registration, the establishment of what is called one man one vote, the equalisation of the

Death Duties, and many more such proposals. (Laughter.) It is all very well for Gentlemen to amuse themselves, and I do not grudge their amusement at these measures. But what is the fact? The fact is that these are the issues which have been placed before the country. I do not speak of every one of these as standing in the same category, and I will not say that every one of them has the assent of every one on this side of the House; but, speaking generally, they are the measures which represent the essential character of Liberal policy, and they are the measures which in conjunction—and I say even in subordination to the great question of our relations with Ireland—have received the distinct stamp of the approbation of the country. I admit that a debate of this kind cannot be altogether retrospective. It is impossible that the various and keen interests that are felt by numbers of Members in the public questions that have been opened—it is impossible that these should not make themselves felt in the shape of pressure upon those who are supposed to guide in any way the councils of Parties, or who have taken a prominent part in the proceedings of this House for the purpose of obtaining some light, for the future. It is not, however, for me to say—I do not think I have any right to anticipate—who are the persons who are likely to govern this country if the vote of the House to be given on Thursday evening should result in the displacement of the present Government. It is not possible, I think, even if a new Government were in existence, for them to say what they would undertake to submit to Parliament six months hence. Now, I am bound to go a little further, and to say I think if they were prepared to pledge themselves to the adoption of the suggestion which was made last night, in the event of their being called to Office—namely, of a Session in the month of November—I think they would only show a very inadequate sense of the magnitude and variety of the subjects with which they had to cope and the volume of work they would have to go through before they could be in a position to meet Parliament. It cannot be said with propriety, in my opinion—even if I

*Mr. W. E. Gladstone*

consider myself as giving an abstract opinion—what would be the various subjects that ought to be brought, and in what order, under the consideration of Parliament when it shall meet at the regular time. But I admit that there is one marked feature of the present situation which makes it necessary to say a few words, and that is the remarkable competition—if I may so call it—which has been established between the interests and claims of Ireland on the one side and the interests and claims of Great Britain on the other side. No one, I think, who hears me will for a moment doubt that there is much substance both in the one and in the other of these considerations. I take first the question of the claims of Ireland, because ever since the year 1886—I might perhaps say 1885—they have been to the forefront of the battle. That is the position they have held all along; that is the position they now hold. To the vast mass of legislation which the country desires to be provided for it as soon as may be, at the hands of its chosen Representatives, I apply that declaration concerning Ireland to its place in competition with other subjects. The right hon. Gentleman last night was disposed to deny, as I understand him, that the majority of those who sit on this side of the House had been returned upon the Home Rule Question. Well, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman, I think, stated that so far as he and his friends were concerned they had made Ireland the determining question. I freely concede to him the right, as well as the duty, of saying what it is they have made the determining question. Then I claim the right for us to say what we have made the determining consideration, and I contend that through all these six or seven years, not always with equally absorbing predominance, but in the main and in a degree perhaps never equalled in our Parliamentary history, the question of Ireland has been the determining question. Now, Sir, my hon. Friend the Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy) put to me, with regard to Ireland, two questions, upon which I will give him such answer as I think the state of the case admits. They might be called bye-questions, in relation to the present great situation ;

but they are bye-questions of such a nature that I quite understand the interest he feels about them and his desire to know whether I can give him information on the subject. The first of them related to what I think has been known by the name of amnesty, and we know that the right hon. Gentleman the present Home Secretary has had in view the consideration of the sentences passed on persons who were imprisoned some eight or ten years ago. The second related to what is known as the case of the evicted tenants. In regard to the case of amnesty, I am sure my hon. Friend will agree with me when I say that it is impossible for those who are not responsible Ministers to give any pledge or understanding to deal with criminal cases, either in respect of the revision of sentences or the exercise of the prerogative of mercy, because that duty can only be properly performed by those who have full knowledge of the facts and possess full responsibility. At the same time, I have no difficulty in reminding my hon. Friend that in every case of criminal conviction it is the duty of the Secretary of State, at any time when cause may appear, to examine allegations of miscarriage of justice, and not only allegations of miscarriage of justice, but to consider all circumstances which may point either to the mitigation or the remission of any sentences that may have been imposed. In regard to long sentences, I believe I am stating what is known to the world in general when I say that regular rules are established for the review, at fixed periods, of these long sentences, in order that questions of their mitigation or remission may duly and fully be brought under consideration ; and a Home Secretary, to whatever Party he belongs, finds it a necessary portion of his duty to go through sentences requiring re-examination. Well, Sir, with regard to the evicted tenants, the insertion of special provisions in the Land Act of 1889 for meeting the case of the evicted tenants shows the importance attached by Parliament—I think I may say without distinction of Party—to that subject. Unfortunately, the time allowed in that measure proved to be insufficient for the object in view. Quite apart from any question of the



change of Government, I venture to express the hope that during the coming autumn voluntary arrangements may, for the sake of all persons concerned, be arrived at, between landlords and tenants, and that in this way all necessity for further legislation may be obviated, which further legislation undoubtedly might, if these arrangements were not arrived at, become requisite. I pass on now to say a few words on the great question of the claims of Ireland in regard to the settlement of her government. I will not enter into the particulars of that settlement. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer spoke at one time as if he were in painful ignorance as to the principle on which any measure for giving autonomy to Ireland would be founded; but I observed at another part of his speech, when his object was to cast reproach upon the coming measure, he entertained no such difficulty. He made his assumptions without any hesitation as to the inconvenience which would arise from the presence of Irish Members in this House to interfere in British questions; and his memory did not appear to be burdened, nor did the consciences of any who sat near him appear to be burdened, by the recollection that those inconveniences had already been rather smartly experienced by those sitting on this side of the House when in 1885, by combination between the Irish Party and the whole of the Conservative Party—then most ready to embrace them with open arms—Gentlemen sitting near me were ejected from Office, an ejection of which I have never, in public or private, made the smallest complaint. But, Sir, I cannot enter into the question of the particulars of the Home Rule Bill; its principles are perfectly well known, and they are limited, on the one hand, by the full and effectual maintenance of that Imperial supremacy which pervades the whole Empire, and, on the other hand, by the equally full and effectual transference to Ireland of the management and control of her own local concerns. As to the question of the admission of the Irish Members to this House, I have done everything that could be done. I have pointed out, in addressing my constituents with feelings of its expediency, the various

modes in which such a thing may be done, the various forms of inconvenience which might be thought to attend it, the strong desire of the country that in one of its forms or another it should be done; and I have explicitly indicated that if a Liberal Government were called to Office it would plainly be the duty of that Government on its responsibility to select the best of these forms—a question it cannot possibly decide until it is in a position of responsibility, and, having selected it, that it should do its best to incorporate it and pass it into law. Now, Sir, the question—if I may so far trespass on the indulgence of the House as to speak of myself personally—the question of Ireland is indeed to me almost everything. I have endeavoured throughout my career to fulfil my obligations in public life, and I may say that the question of Ireland is almost, if not altogether, my sole link with public life. It has been for the last seven years my primary and absorbing interest, and so it will continue to be. That question is one which for me has far deeper and much more far-reaching concern than any other. This Parliament, it seems to be assumed, will address itself seriously, as indeed I hope and am sure it will, to the question of the Irish claims for self-government in all Irish affairs. The Home Rule Bill, it is anticipated, will pass through this House. If it receives the assent of the majority of the House it will go to the House of Lords, and I cannot wonder at my hon. Friend the Member for North Longford experiencing some anxiety as to its future—its further destinies—because, undoubtedly, there was a period in my recollection, namely, in the time of the Government of Lord Melbourne, when there was a majority of this House in favour of a Liberal policy towards Ireland, and when that majority found itself constrained to be content with passing certain measures through this House year after year, with sending them to the House of Lords, there to be fatally mutilated or altogether lost. That being so, I must venture to say that I think when such a Bill has passed this House, springing as it will out of a tenacious controversy that has lasted for seven years, and has been carried on with such zeal and ability

*Mr. W. E. Gladstone*

on all sides and with such diversity of circumstances and such careful consideration of detail—I think, Sir, when that Bill comes before the House of Lords, it may justly be said that never before will the Lords have had before them a greater question as to the Empire at large, never before them a greater question, possibly, as to themselves. Into other subjects I do not intend to enter, because I do not think any beneficial result would arise from my taking such a course, and my hon. Friend did not invite me to do so. He did, however, invite me to signify my opinion as to what would be the position and duty of the Liberal Party in the unhappy and deplorable event of the rejection of such a measure by the other House of Parliament. I will not argue now upon the probability of that rejection. (A laugh.) I am very sorry to hear even a single exhibition of anything like levity in this matter, and I am sure even any Member who might be inclined to look at the question from the point of view which Party supplies, will feel that before we emerge from this complex situation circumstances may happen which will be no laughing matter, and it is our plain, absolute, and primary duty to avoid all language and all sentiments which may tend to aggravate the difficulties which will attend the settlement of this grave question. When my hon. Friend asks me what would be the duty of the Liberal Party under a Liberal Government in such a case, the only answer I can give him is this—that I do not think a repetition of the transactions in the time of the Melbourne Government, between 1835 and 1841, would be at this moment either politic or just, and on this ground in particular: that in our view, at least, the sentiments of the people of this country towards the people of Ireland have undergone a fundamental change—at least, among our friends and constituents who have returned us here, prejudices against Irishmen do not now exist. We have to consider obligations to English as well as to Irish sentiments with a view to the adjustment of this great question. Sir, if I am asked what would be the duty of the Liberal Government in such a contingency as has been shadowed forth, I must say, in the first place, I

cannot in words fully express what I think of the earnestness and the intensity with which I desire that no such contingency should arise. If it did arise, I must also admit that I cannot entertain any doubt as to the duty of the Liberal Government. It would be impossible for any such Government to regard the rejection of such a Bill as terminating its duty. So far as the essence and substance of that measure were concerned, the obligations of the Liberal Government would utterly forbid acquiescence, and those obligations to promote the settlement of that great subject in the best manner would remain unweakened and unchanged. I do not think, Sir, that, under present circumstances, it is right to go beyond that general declaration. But then I have said that there are the claims of Great Britain, and it must not be supposed they have been overlooked or undervalued. The effect of the conflict of the last six years has been undoubtedly to retard the fulfilment of the hopes of Ireland; but it has, on the other hand, led to an immense and accelerated development of British wants. I think it quite impossible to point to any six years of our history in which there has been anything approaching that development, or the zeal and ability with which the people of this country are prepared to urge the prosecution of measures necessary to meet these wants. I am not now going to name them—it would be vain to attempt it, but I wish to say this, without the smallest prejudice to what I have said in regard to Irish subjects: that together with Irish questions and upon the same footing it would be the absolute duty, in my opinion, of a Liberal Government to make a serious and resolute effort—aye, even in the year 1893, to deal—I do not say with the whole case; I think that would be beyond the scope of the Session—but to deal with a sensible, aye, a considerable portion of those measures. That, I think, is no unfair adjustment of the question which undoubtedly arises at this moment. While there has been so long a possession of the field in a very great degree by the Irish Question, there has also been this remarkable and probably unexampled development of British wants and desires. And now,

Sir, I will only say one word more. We have heard in this Debate of an attempt to coerce Great Britain. No, Sir; there is no attempt to coerce Great Britain. Great Britain cannot be coerced. Scotland is a portion of Great Britain. There is no attempt to coerce Scotland, for Scotland has returned a majority of more than two to one in favour of the Irish claims. There is no attempt to coerce Wales, for Wales has returned a still larger majority—a majority larger in proportion than Ireland herself—on behalf of the prosecution of Ireland's claims. What is meant by the Party opposite, I presume, is an attempt to coerce England. Now, Sir, England never can be coerced even by the joint action of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, in questions where she has a strong, deliberate, and clear conviction. Sir, the case is a very peculiar one. It is a partnership of three Kingdoms, a partnership of four nationalities, for the Principality of Wales, if not a separate Kingdom, may claim in a great degree a separate nationality. Such is the relation of these three Kingdoms that England in itself contains, I suppose, nearly three-fourths of the population and wealth of the entire aggregate. What is the lesson that ought to be learnt from this state of things? England in that combination has a giant's strength, and the lesson to be learnt is that she should not use it like a giant. In that direction England has shown a great disposition to learn, and we have seen, by the large change that has taken place in the expression of sentiment on a recent occasion, that she becomes more and more accessible to earnest petitions from our Irish fellow-subjects, and more and more disposed to do them justice. It would be most unfortunate if the Party opposite, or any Party in this country, ever came to place undue reliance on what I admit to be the enormous and overpowering strength of England as against the comparatively insignificant strength of the other members of the combination. It would be most unfortunate in the sense of being most impolitic, and would lead to trouble—I am speaking of Parliamentary trouble, for I am not resorting to threats—and policy and prudence, I think, direct

*Mr. W. E. Gladstone*

that England, with that vast and overwhelming strength, should be merciful and considerate in the use of that strength. Yes, Sir, for after all moral force in some of these great national causes will fight a not unequal battle with that force which is material. It is moral and not material force that has brought forward the Irish claims to the present position. It is moral, not material force which will lead, I think without doubt, to the peaceful adjustment of whatever questions may be raised—different probably in order and degree—but, at any rate, whatever questions may be raised between England on the one side and Scotland and Wales and Ireland on the other. It is the predominance of that moral force for which I heartily pray in the deliberations of this House and the conduct of our whole public policy, for I am convinced that upon that predominance depends that which should be the first object of all our desires, as it is of all our daily official prayers—namely, that union of heart and sentiment which constitutes the truest basis of strength at home, and, therefore, both of strength and good fame throughout the civilised world.

(4.53.) THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire this afternoon—it is fortunately unnecessary—to drag into our Debate subjects which have been in the past, and may again be in the future, matters of controversy. That desire of mine will, I think, become evident when I pass by without a word the peroration of the right hon. Gentleman, in which he has had the courage to inform us—us who have watched pretty closely the course of events in Ireland during the last twelve years—that the force which that country has exercised on the course of British politics is derived from moral considerations. Surely, in the whole copious vocabulary of the English language there is not an adjective more infelicitous which the right hon. Gentleman could possibly have chosen. If he had said that they had used material methods to obtain their ends—if he had said that they had used immoral methods I should have understood him; but that of all adjectives he

should have selected the single word "moral" does indeed show an oblivion of facts, which I should have thought to have been burned into his memory by the bitter experience of five years of government, when he was at the head of the Administration, but which I, at all events, do not for a moment wish to call particularly or in greater detail to his recollection. Sir, the right hon. Gentleman appears to consider it a matter of great complaint that this Debate should have arisen at all; he spoke on this subject with a kind of sense of ill-usage. But surely up to this time the course of the Debate has hardly justified the objection of the right hon. Gentleman. We have had an interesting and somewhat nebulous speech from the right hon. Gentleman himself, and speeches not at all nebulous, and almost equally interesting, from the Leaders of two sections of the present Opposition who we understand are going to unite to expel the present Government from Office. Had these three speeches stood alone it would have been worth while having this two days' Debate, and I propose before I sit down to expand some of the morals which may be drawn from these important utterances. Before I do so may I pass very lightly over what I conceive to have been a reply by anticipation on the part of the right hon. Gentleman to a speech which he supposed I was going to deliver. He has stated, I believe, in public that I propose to review the whole course of the present Administration during the six eventful years during which it has held power; and with the view of discounting beforehand any effects which my rhetoric on that subject might produce, the right hon. Gentleman has given a short sketch of his view of the successes of the present Government in dealing with Irish questions and the legislation of the United Kingdom. I never thought of inflicting on the House any defence whatever of the present Government. I conceive what we have done in the past is now a matter of history, and has to be judged, and can only be judged, by historians; and although I have no doubt whatever as to what that verdict will be, I do not wish at present either to anticipate or defend it. But I think the right

hon. Gentleman need not have put himself to the trouble of repeating here, almost verbatim, some of the speeches which he has recently delivered before his constituents, and, at all events, if he felt constrained to take the trouble to utter again his well-worn version of the origin of the Plan of Campaign, of the rejection of Mr. Parnell's Bill in 1886, and of the condition of tranquillity in Ireland which existed at the time of the passing of the Coercion Act, he might have done—I will not say me—but the Party on this side the honour to consider some of the objections we have before raised upon the historical accuracy of the right hon. Gentleman's recollection. For my part, I have refuted till I am sick of refuting the astonishing fables which, under the guise of the history of Ireland, the right hon. Gentleman put forward on these various occasions; and if I have failed to convince him in the past that he is entirely mistaken in every single one of the statements he has made, I can hardly hope now, at the end of the eleventh hour, to bring him to a better frame of mind. But I may remind him, when he says that Ireland was tranquillised in 1884, that he himself proposed to prolong the Coercion Act in 1885. I may, perhaps, remind him that in 1885 the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Bridgeton Division (Sir George Trevelyan), speaking with the authority of an ex-Irish Secretary, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), speaking with the authority of a present Chief Secretary, and Lord Spencer, speaking with the authority of a Viceroy of Ireland, the right hon. Gentleman will not deny, absolutely traversed the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that Ireland was in such a state of tranquillity that no criminal legislation was necessary.

MR. GLADSTONE: But that does not affect the statement that Ireland was in a condition of general peace. What Lord Spencer said was that there were two particular provisions of the Coercion Act which it was intended to keep alive, dropping all the rest.

MR. BALFOUR: No, Sir. But if the right hon. Gentleman will do the two right hon. Gentlemen who are

sitting on either side of him the honour of studying their statements with regard to the condition of intimidation in Ireland in those years, he will see that I have not in any way exaggerated the fact. I recollect that the right hon. Gentleman himself in 1886, on the occasion when he introduced the Coercion Act, did not speak of Ireland as being in a state of tranquillity, but, on the contrary, an essential part of the argument by which he endeavoured to commend his scheme of Home Rule to this House was that, as a matter of fact, they could not govern Ireland on the same principles as they governed England, and that without Home Rule it was necessary to have exceptional legislation. And I may further remind him that, in the first place, he directly misquotes the Government when he says that they brought in the Coercion Act or the Crimes Act of 1887 upon the statistics of agrarian crime. He is wrong when he states that, because I distinctly said that that was only one and not the most important part of the Government case. The right hon. Gentleman has altogether left out the intimidation and the terrorism which prevailed. It was chiefly on the intimidation and terrorism which prevailed that we based the necessity for the Act. But we did point to the statistics of agrarian crime in that year, and we showed—and showed conclusively—that agrarian crime in Ireland had been steadily rising for the few years preceding; and we also showed that the amount of crime then existing in Ireland was far larger than the amount of crime which the right hon. Gentleman himself thought an adequate justification for introducing the Crimes Act of 1871.

MR. GLADSTONE: But that Act was not opposed by the Irish Members in general.

MR. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman may hold the opinion that the fact that the Irish Members oppose a Coercion Act is a sufficient reason for not passing it; but that is not the argument he addressed to the House. I have shown that the right hon. Gentleman is historically wrong when he states that Ireland was in a tranquil state when the Government introduced their Crimes Act. And further than that, my answer is that

Ireland was in a far less tranquil state, on the figures before me, when we introduced our Crimes Act, than it was when he introduced his Crimes Act in 1871. That is one of the examples of the right hon. Gentleman's perversion of Irish history. I might go on and make an equal exposure of the fallacy of the right hon. Gentleman's argument as to the origin of the Plan of Campaign. I might refer him to the undoubted fact that Mr. Parnell's Bill dealt only with the arrears of tenants who had had judicial rents fixed. It was never pretended that it would relieve other tenants whose rents were in arrear; but those who invented that form of criminal conspiracy, as everyone knew, privately, from the first, have avowed publicly that the Plan of Campaign was a political weapon forged by politicians for political ends. I pass now from the review of Irish history which the right hon. Gentleman gave to the consideration of his general objection to the line we have taken in meeting Parliament on this occasion, and in discussing the present and future aspect of public affairs. I must protest against the right hon. Gentleman's interpretation of precedents. In meeting Parliament we are strictly following the best precedents. We are following strictly the precedents of 1841, for example, and of 1859. We are not following the precedents of 1868, 1874, 1880, or 1886. I quite admit that. I have two replies to that objection of the right hon. Gentleman. My first reply is that the older precedents are precedents of far longer standing—that the older precedents have behind them a far longer concatenation of authorities to support them, and that the precedent of 1868 is an absolutely novel precedent. I have to remind him, in the second place, that the circumstances of the present time in no way resemble those which prevailed in the years 1868, 1874, or 1880. On those occasions the Opposition was returned by a majority absolutely overwhelming in its character and absolutely homogeneous in its character. The Leader of the Opposition in those years came back to this House at the head of a majority on which he could absolutely rely to out-

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

vote not merely what is called the regular Opposition, but the regular Opposition in combination, or not in combination, with any other section of the House. There is no parallelism to that state of things at the present time. The present Government are in a minority, but who is in a majority? The present Government may have lost the confidence of the House, but who has obtained the confidence of the House? The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Fife (Mr. Asquith) yesterday appeared to think that this question was a mere question of arithmetic—a question of addition and subtraction, and that the only authority that could be appealed to was Cocker and the multiplication table. But I do not think that that is the view which has hitherto been taken upon such occasions. The outgoing Government, and the House generally, have a right to review the situation, and to estimate the forces that are arrayed for and against them; to consider the position in which the country at large is placed; what are the prospects of future administration and future legislation; and that they should avail themselves of that opportunity on an occasion like this, when the Party opposed to them is broken up at least into three divisions owning different Leaders, surely requires neither explanation nor justification. I observe that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Fife, and the right hon. Gentleman who has just addressed us (Mr. Gladstone)—and who is not now in his place—resented very much the calculation of my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he analysed this majority into its constituent parts, and calculated it upon the basis not of Party but of country. The hon. and learned Member for Fife said that you might just as well contend that the Government was kept in Office by the Scotch and Welsh votes—and asked why choose this particular line of cleavage in order to try and throw discredit upon the Party to whom you are opposed? Well, I will give ample reasons why we should adopt this mode of choice. I will show conclusively to the House that this division of the non-Unionist Party into Nationalists and Gladstonians is of the very essence of

the present situation, and that it cannot be left out of account for one moment by any man who desires to form an estimate of the present situation. I will give one reason based upon some of the arguments that have been used—and I shall deal with them very briefly—that Home Rule is not, and cannot be, a question of Ireland alone. It is, and must be, a question of the dissolution of partnership between England and Ireland upon equitable terms; and each of the two partners has an equal right to determine what dissolution is to take place, and if it is to take place. And those who say that the interest of England is only a sentimental interest—those who say that after all the only people concerned in Home Rule are the Irish people, I would remind that we have it explicitly on the highest authority that the Irish Members are to be left here as Members of the House of Commons at Westminster. They are to have an important, and perhaps a determining, voice who shall constitute the Government of the day. And the English nation, therefore, as distinguished from the Irish nation, may find itself, indeed must find itself, now and then at the mercy, not of the English Representatives, but of the Representatives from England and from Ireland combined. Therefore the interest of England is at least as great as the interest of Ireland in any question of Home Rule, and we have a right to point out that one of the two partners at least in this ancient partnership objects, and objects strongly, both to the terms on which you propose to dissolve the partnership, and to the fact of the partnership being dissolved at all. But there are other reasons why this analysis into Irish, and non-Irish Members is absolutely necessary. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian has before now had to contemplate the possibility of his being placed exactly in the position in which he now finds himself. He had before now to consider what would be the position and prospects of the Party of which he is the head if they were in a minority in Great Britain, but were in a majority through the assistance of the Irish Members,

He therefore—and not I—is the person who first made himself responsible for this analysis by nationalities of the British House of Commons. I suppose the words are familiar to many here; but they are so apposite that, even at the risk of wearying the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), I will take the liberty of reading them. “I will suppose,” says the right hon. Gentleman, whose absence I very greatly regret—

“that owing to some cause the present Government disappeared, and the Liberal Party is called to deal with the great Constitutional question of the government of Ireland in a position where it was in a minority, dependent on the Irish vote for converting it into a majority.”

By a happy prescience the right hon. Gentleman foresaw the exact situation in which he would find himself in the year 1892—

“I tell you seriously and solemnly that, though I believe the Liberal Party to be honourable, patriotic, and trustworthy, yet in such a position as that it would not be safe for it to enter into the consideration of the particulars of a measure in respect of which, at the very first step of its progress, it would be in the power of the Party coming from Ireland to say—Unless you do this and unless you do that, we will turn you out.”

The right hon. Gentleman is in that position. He has called our attention, in the extract from the speech I have just read, to the very analysis by nationality which we have indulged in. He has pointed out to us what the position of the Liberal Party would be if that contingency should occur—how humiliating of itself, how dangerous to the interests of the Empire; and are we, when his prophecies have been thus fulfilled to the letter, to keep silence in obedience to the Constitutional objection of the hon. and learned Member for Fife (Mr. Asquith); and are we not to show the House the fact that the non-Unionist majority of this House is only partly composed of followers of the right hon. Gentleman, and is, in a large measure, composed of allies who are also his masters? That is a dominant factor in the present political situation. I have called the hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway the allies and masters of the Party opposite. Will anybody deny the truth of that assertion? Many are the situations in history in which you have seen one

country first conquering another, and then compelling it to fight side by side for the destruction of some third Power. That is the position of the Liberal Party. They have been conquered by the hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway; they are marching under their banners, accepting their creed, and aiming at their object, the destruction of the Unionist Party, which their joint forces outnumber. But, at all events, we may be allowed the privilege, before we resign the Offices which we hold, of asking what are the terms and what are the conditions under which this alliance has taken place? I listened with very great interest to two speeches last night, one from the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy), and the other from the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond), only the first of which, I think, was heard by the right hon. Gentleman, and certainly only one of which was answered by the right hon. Gentleman. These two hon. Gentlemen represent, and represent with great ability, two sections of the Nationalist Party, which I may, perhaps, without offence describe on this occasion as the Nationalist Party which has been squared, and the Nationalist Party which has not been squared. Now, what are the demands put forward by these two Parties, jointly or separately? The first demand, made, I think, only by the hon. Member for North Longford, was that the Crimes Act, until it should be repealed, should, at all events, be suspended, and, in so far as it is not suspended, should be administered according to public opinion. Well, that is a very vague request, and the answer to it was even more vague. I would remind the hon. Member that at this moment the greater part of the Crimes Act is not in operation over the greater part of Ireland. A clause empowering change of venue, a clause empowering special juries, and a clause permitting summary jurisdiction in cases of riot are in operation, I think, over Ireland generally. Therefore, if there is any change made in the present situation, it must be by suspending these three clauses also. Do I understand the hon. Member for North Longford to require this change, and do I understand the right hon.

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

Gentleman the Member for Midlothian to have agreed to the suspension of these clauses? That is a very clear and a very precise issue. In the negotiations which have gone on between these two gentlemen they must surely have come to an understanding on this point. Why should the subject be surrounded by all these clouds of mystery; why is it still part of the nebular hypothesis? Who is going to be the successor of my right hon. Friend the present Chief Secretary we know not; but if he is going to attempt to govern Ireland without maintaining some power of changing venue, without some power of dealing summarily with cases of riot, I do not envy his task, either in or out of Ulster; and I do not say that it is out of Ulster that all his difficulties will occur. I am very curious to know if there should be some unhappy recrudescence of the difficulties which assailed the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle in 1886; and if he has to deal—

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): Oh!

MR. BALFOUR: Do you anticipate it? And if he has to deal again as he had to deal before with some of the difficulties arising out of the unhappy history of Ireland in that part of the country, whether he is going deliberately to abstain from employing the weapons put into his hands for enforcing the law by means of the Crimes Act or whether he is not? I think it would be very interesting to know that. I think it would be also very interesting to know what he means to do in other parts of Ireland. Is he going to depend upon hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway for keeping order in the South and West of Ireland? Is he going to put himself in the humiliating position of keeping order in that part of the country by the aid of men who have not always shown themselves on the side of order? If he is not going to rely upon them, but simply upon the ordinary law, I tell him he will fail, as every one of his predecessors has failed. It is only by using the power that hon. Gentlemen to whom I have referred have got, and by using that power unsparingly, to carry out a policy precisely opposite to that hitherto

carried out, that he can hope to do without these exceptional means of enforcing the law which are at his hands at present, and which every one of his predecessors has unhappily, from time to time, been obliged to use. I should like, before I leave that first condition of hon. Members below the Gangway, to ask precisely what is meant by administering the law according to public opinion? Public opinion in Ireland upon this important subject as it is represented by hon. Members below the Gangway is in favour, as far as I can make out, of boycotting, of intimidation, and of all the other methods—I hope, in the main, short of physical violence—which have reduced parts of the country to a hell upon earth. Is that the public opinion which is to be regarded in administering the law in Ireland? Under this vague phrase of the hon. Member for North Longford what is concealed? What is the precise meaning, in the compact which took place between him and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, of the clause which says that the law is to be administered according to public opinion? How much has the hon. Gentleman asked for; how much has been given him? Surely we have a right, before this Debate closes, to know whether the price of the seventy-five Gentlemen who hold your political fortune in their hands has been the lives, the property, and the security of the loyal portion of Ireland? (“Oh!”) I observe some hon. Members dislike this discussion. I pass to the second condition—and I will be as brief as I can—imposed by both the Leaders of the Nationalist Party with regard to the dynamiters now in prison under the Treason Felony Act. And here I noticed that only one name was mentioned—the name of Egan. As the House is well aware, my right hon. Friend near me has himself stated in the House that there were circumstances in the case of Egan which made it different from the case of some other persons who were convicted under that Act. But I apprehend that, although Egan’s was the only name mentioned, it was not in regard to Egan that the chief interest was felt, and I am curious to know



whether under the pledge extracted by the Members below the Gangway, and under the nebulous statement made by the right hon. Gentleman above the Gangway, there is any understanding that Daly, for example, is to be at once let loose upon society. The right hon. Gentleman said something about there being a period at which criminals undergoing long sentences had their whole position inquired into. But that period in the case of Daly will not occur for two years. I should like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman is under a pledge to anticipate that period? Is it a part of the compact under which the seventy-five hon. Members of the Nationalist Party of Ireland are to be taken into your Lobby on Thursday to vote against the Government that Daly and his associates are to be let loose upon the world? The third question I have to ask you is about the evicted tenants. I noticed that there was a considerable difference on this question between the Leader of the Party which has been squared and the Leader of the Party which has not been squared. The hon. Member for North Longford asked for an inquiry. The hon. Member for Waterford asks for something rather more substantial. I confess that from the point of view of those hon. Members and of those who voted for the most extravagant Bill brought in last Session on this subject, a great deal more ought to be granted than an inquiry. Who are these Plan of Campaign tenants who are now evicted? They are the instruments that you have used to gain your political objects. If they are without roofs over their heads at this moment it is your doing; then you are going to give them an inquiry. If they are without food to eat it is your doing, and you are going to give them an inquiry; and when you have given them an inquiry, what are you going to do for them then? I suppose there are some thousands of tenants now in possession of farms from which others have been evicted. (Laughter.) That is my belief, after having taken some trouble to investigate the facts.

MR. TIMOTHY HEALY (Louth, N.): What about the Returns?

MR. BALFOUR: Well, the hon. and learned Gentleman, no doubt, hopes to be the humble follower

of a Government that will give him anything he asks for. I say that, having made some investigation into this question, I believe there are certainly more than two thousand, perhaps more than three thousand, tenants in possession of evicted farms. ("No!") These men whom you propose to turn out neck and crop if you can pass a Bill—well, of course, you cannot—what are you going to do for them then? These men whom an ex-Cabinet Minister—and I suppose a prospective Cabinet Minister—went down to encourage in their wrongdoing with promises of the assistance of any Government of which he might be a Member, what assistance would they be prepared to give to those unfortunate persons? Certainly, I see little prospect of substantial aid being given to them. But why it was thought worth while to wave before the eyes of those unfortunate persons this absurd—I was going to use a stronger word—this absurd expedient of a public or a private inquiry I cannot imagine. Do you think you could keep them quiet by that? Do you think you could keep their friends quiet? Will you keep them from starving? Will you keep them out of want? You know well enough that this is a merely colourable pretence, that will enable you to give your votes in favour of gentlemen whom you think will become your very subservient tools in the future. Well, on one more subject there were a great many questions asked by the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond) on which no answer has been given at all. His speech was fully reported. It comes from a not unimportant Member of this House. How was it that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian absolutely ignored every one of these questions? I imagine that he found it inconvenient. I have not been one of those who, though very anxious for information, have made any attack on hon. Gentlemen opposite for not giving details of their Bill. There seemed to me to be perfectly adequate reasons why they should not do so. In the first place, I do not believe that they know them. I do not believe they know what it is. In the second place, I believe, when their Bill comes before us, if they carry out half the promises

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

they have made on the subject, they will make themselves a spectacle before the whole of the civilised world, and no man is bound to make of himself a spectacle before it becomes absolutely necessary. But it really is rather important to us to know, as soon as we can, certain broad principles which hon. Gentlemen are always talking about, and on which, therefore, I presume they have made up their minds, but on which they have never yet told us in precise terms what they mean. One of these things was alluded to to-day by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian—namely, the supremacy of the British Parliament. I listened with all my ears to him, and for the life of me I cannot conceive what he meant. The hon. Member for Waterford was perfectly clear and explicit in his demands. He said plainly enough—

“No Bill will satisfy the Irish people which enables the British Legislature, upon any pretence whatever or in any circumstances whatever, to meddle with Irish affairs, to legislate for Ireland, or to disallow anything done by an Irish Parliament.”

That was a perfectly precise and explicit demand. Is that demand to be granted or not? If it is to be granted, how do you mean to defend yourselves before the English people? If it is not to be granted, how do you mean to deal with the seventy-five Gentlemen from Ireland? Although the Member for Waterford speaks for a small section of the Nationalist Party, is there a single one of the seventy-five Gentlemen there congregated who will dare to get up and say that on this question the Member for Waterford does not speak the mind of the whole of the Nationalist Party? Is there a single man on those Benches who, with or without a compact with Gentlemen opposite, will dare to state that he means to allow the British Parliament to intervene to control the actions of the Irish Parliament? There is none—not one cheer is given, not one reply; and I take it that the supremacy of the British Parliament, which has been flaunted at the English Elections as a reason why Home Rule should be granted to Ireland, is a mere matter of paper and sealing wax, that it is

to have no operative effect at all, and that the Irish nation, whom you say you are going to content, will never be contented without that absolute control which is inconsistent with any supremacy of this Parliament whatever. There is one more point, which is, perhaps, the most important of all, with respect to which hon. Gentlemen have made categorical demands to right hon. Gentlemen who sit opposite. What is to be the position, in the legislative labours of this House, to be occupied by the Home Rule Bill? On that both the Member for Longford and the Member for Waterford have agreed in demanding not only that it should be brought in first, not only that it should be passed first, but that, if it is rejected—as we all know it will be rejected—(“Oh!”)—in another place, the same operation is to be repeated, and that so long as the incoming Government hold Office it will be their bounden duty, Session after Session, to go the same weary round, to make the same barren efforts, to bring in the same preposterous measure, and to occupy our time, year after year, with, I will not call them legislative labours, but with interminable discussions which can be of no earthly good to any class in the community.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The right hon. Gentleman is not entitled to make such a statement as that. I referred to concurrent legislation.

MR. BALFOUR: I recollect perfectly well what the hon. Member said. He said he would permit concurrent legislation for England; he was good enough to say that. In other words, in the interstices of the Home Rule Bill are to be introduced the great list of legislative changes which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian read out of an extract from his own Newcastle speech. That is the demand of Ireland. If that demand is not granted, if Home Rule is put in the background, I suppose the Irish Members will exercise the power of which they have very justly boasted more than once, and will extrude the incoming Government from Office—an agreeable prospect for Gentlemen opposite. They can now estimate exactly what is meant by the confidence of

Parliament. They tell us that we do not possess that confidence. I dare say we do not: Thursday will show. Do they think that they possess it? I understand a general possessing the confidence of his soldiers when he can lead them whither he will, and direct his manœuvres as he chooses. Is that the confidence which hon. Gentlemen possess? They know very well that it is not. They possess the confidence of the House much in the same sense in which a slave possesses the confidence of his master when he knows he will be scourged into doing any operations, however revolting to him, when he is required. Gentlemen below the Gangway may be sparing, or they may not be sparing, in the use of the rod. We cannot prophesy. But for hon. Gentlemen opposite to come to us and tell us that we should at once, without discussion in this House, give up to them the Seals of Office because they possess the confidence of the country is, as they will find out sooner or later, greatly to abuse Parliamentary language. Therefore it is that we, who are the beaten Party, look forward with hope and confidence to the future, and you, who are the victorious Party, look forward to that same future with perplexity and in despair. We know that the future is with us. We know, and we know after this Debate as we never could have known it before, that if the work of social and domestic legislation is to be undertaken by this House at all, it is to be undertaken by Gentlemen who sit on this side of the House, and not by Gentlemen who sit on that. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Fife (Mr. Asquith), in an eloquent peroration to an eloquent speech, told us last night that we, the Conservative Party, had abandoned our historic position, and that by entering upon the course of legislation which has signalised the present Government we have been truckling to the Liberal Unionist Party, and had abandoned convictions that had always been dear to us. The fact is that my hon. and learned Friend has not given this matter as much study as he ought to have given to it. He has drawn his picture of the Conservative Party from those caricatures which doubtless did excellent duty on many a

Radical platform in Scotland and England. But he will study it better in the authentic records of this House. If he will look at the Statute Book and consider our social legislation, and will consider who has in the past dealt with these social questions, he will find that in absolute amount we have done far more than the Party to which he belongs, and that, relatively to the number of years we have been in Office, our record is even better. What is the use of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian getting up and giving us a string of the measures that he has tried to pass during the last five years and has failed to pass? Of course in Opposition he could not pass anything. I blame him not. I do not think, however, he deserves much credit for this barren string of unfulfilled legislation. The point is, what is done by the Party when it really has control over the time of the House; and when you compare what has been done by the Unionist Party and by the Conservative Party in the past, and if you compare it with what has happened in any similar period of time by the Party of which the Member for Fife is one of its great ornaments, I think you and he will find that the events point out that it is with us and not with them that the future treatment of these great questions must essentially depend. I do not mean to enumerate the legislative proposals which if we were to remain in Office we should make, because I have done it already with the utmost publicity which I could give to them, with the full assent of my colleagues, speaking as a Member of the Government and responsible for what I said. I have publicly stated in detail the kind of legislation to which I think this House should devote itself to accomplishing in the immediate future. You propose to turn us out, and therefore that legislation will not be undertaken by us. Will it be undertaken by you? Is there the slightest prospect in the future that you, who, as I understand, have got on your shoulders first a Home Rule Bill, secondly the repeal of the Crimes Act, and thirdly the destruction of the House of Lords—is it likely that you, who have got in the forefront of your programme these agreeable tasks, are going to find much

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

time in the interstices of these important labours to pass that legislation which this country so heartily desires, when you are bound by the action of your allies below the Gangway? Of this I am convinced, after having seen a great deal of the recent Election like other Members, possibly more than many people, and being thus in a position to estimate the course and growth of public opinion—I believe that this country have returned Gentlemen opposite under an absolutely mistaken conviction. They have returned them under the belief that they are going to deal with the Newcastle Programme. They are not going to deal with the Newcastle Programme. They have returned them under the belief that when they are once in Office they will be able to compel them to deal with these social questions. They will not be able to deal with these social questions. Therefore it is that I am sure that sooner or later the disappointed electors will turn to the Party which has the will and which has the leisure to press forward all these great subjects to a legitimate issue. They will be sick, and sick very soon, of Nationalist domination. They will be sick of impotent administration; they will be sick of these abortive and barren attacks upon the Constitution of the country, and they will turn to a Party which has surely shown itself, in the last six eventful years, not unworthy to frame the laws or to guide the destinies of this great Empire.

(5.50.) MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): The right hon. Gentleman has made one observation with which I entirely agree. He said that this Debate has not been fruitless. Well, I quite agree with him. A Debate which has produced such a speech as that to which we have just listened, and such a speech as that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer last night, is not fruitless. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman was the speech of a beaten and desperate man. Now what did the right hon. Gentleman do? He alluded, with ill-concealed glee and approval, to what he is pleased to call the recrudescence of disturbance in Belfast. I denounce that statement and that appeal of the right hon. Gentleman as one of the most iniqui-

tous ever made by a Minister of the Crown, for what does it amount to? The right hon. Gentleman means to hint and suggest to the Orangemen of Belfast that they should repeat in 1892 the proceedings of 1886. What took place in 1886? The houses of Catholics were wrecked, the property of Catholics was destroyed, the lives of Catholics were taken, and the police of the Crown, to whose protection the right hon. Gentleman owes as much as any man in this House, were shot down in the public streets. That is the state of things to the recrudescence of which the right hon. Gentleman looks forward. What does it mean? That in order to embarrass a Liberal Administration the champion of law and order is ready to suggest disorder and disturbance in Ireland. My right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle has heard the language. I do not know whether he will be the successor of the present Chief Secretary; but if his administration be embarrassed by disturbance or riot in Belfast or in Ulster generally, then the words of the First Lord of the Treasury will come back to our memory, and we shall assert—and the facts will prove it—that these disturbances in Ireland are political events produced by politicians for political purposes. The First Lord of the Treasury was also very eloquent against us for not having been sufficiently eager in the defence of order, and his constant charge during the past six years is that we have promoted disorder for political purposes. I, however, deny the charge, and I say that if any disturbances take place in Ulster—I do not know whether they will or not—the law will be strong enough to deal with them, and I shall denounce the right hon. Gentleman for having deliberately incited them to embarrass his political opponents. The right hon. Gentleman was candid enough to say that the Coercion Act of 1887 was not passed simply because of the amount of grave and serious crime in Ireland. I am sorry that the right hon. Gentleman did not make the same admission on the platforms during the recent Election, for what did I find wherever I went, especially if I had followed the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell)? I found

that the Act of 1887 was defended as having been brought in because of cases of wholesale murder, of murder walking abroad in the daylight, of a state of crime in Ireland that made it almost a Saturnalia of wickedness. The First Lord of the Treasury allowed these statements to go uncontradicted in order that his Party might make profit out of them. To-night he has made the confession that the Coercion Act of 1887 was passed, not against crime, but against combination in Ireland. If he had made that statement on the hustings, the majority against him would probably have been a little larger than it is. The right hon. Gentleman has also complained of the Leader of the Opposition speaking of the moral force by which we have advocated our movement. He was quite qualified to make that statement. The patron of Pigott has a perfect right to complain of immoral methods of procedure in political warfare. I have never shared the somewhat pessimist conclusions of some of my hon. Friends upon the result of the late Election—first, because the majority of this House does not adequately and proportionately represent the majority of the votes of the country; and, secondly, because that majority, as I shall presently show, represents not free and pure elections on the part of hon. Gentlemen opposite, but elections conducted under a system of public and universal debauchery unexampled in the history of this country. But if I had ever felt the pessimist conclusions of my hon. Friends, the speeches of the last two nights would be sufficient to dispel them. There was an elegiac tone pervading the speeches of the other side. My right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle once delivered a lecture on epigrams. I would suggest that he should take epitaphs as the subject of his next lecture, and largely quote the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Seconder of the reply to the Address. Then we had the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I have watched the Chancellor of the Exchequer a good many years in this House. Yesterday evening saw his Nemesis. For many years he has used his great but maleficent powers in this House for the purpose

of defending every act of landlord oppression in Ireland, for the purpose of rejoicing over every Irish rooftop levelled to the ground; and he came last night and he supplicated the Irish Members—he begged, he implored, he beseeched the Irish Members—if they could not admit him as a sort of tenant, to leave him at least as a sort of humble caretaker on the premises. I shall return to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman presently, but I should like to say a few words about the speech of the hon. Member for Bordesley (Mr. Jesse Collings). The hon. Member for Bordesley was much shocked that he found in the Rugby Division a placard with these words, "Vote for Cobb and Parish Councils." My hon. Friend the Member for the Rugby Division is able to defend himself, but I beg to say this to him, with the assent of everybody on this side of the House: that a truer, more loyal friend of the agricultural labourers does not exist either inside or outside this House. I would like to ask the hon. Member for Bordesley two or three questions. I do not see the hon. Member in his place, but I should like to ask him, if he were there, in the first place, does he believe that Parish Councils are a good thing? I think he would have to answer that question in the affirmative. I would next ask him, has he any doubt that the next Liberal Administration will propose Parish Councils? I think he would also reply to that in the affirmative. Then my next question would be, does he believe that they will pass Parish Councils? I am afraid the hon. Gentleman will have to give a somewhat doubtful answer to that question, because undoubtedly his friends and allies on the other side will do their best to prevent the passage of that and all other Liberal measures of reform. But I will challenge the hon. Gentleman to say that there will not be an obstructive and unscrupulous opposition to Parish Councils if proposed by a Liberal Administration, and my answer to all this talk about the barrenness of the legislation of the next Government is this: that it will not be barren if the Liberal Unionists are true to Liberal principles, and if the Tory Opposition will be orderly, decent, and well-behaved in

*Mr. T. P. O'Connor*

their opposition. An hon. Friend below me says that that is a little too much to expect; and, to be candid, I do not expect it, for I have some experience, both in accord and in discord with hon. Gentlemen opposite, of the kind of Opposition they form when the Liberal Party is in power. Hon. Gentlemen opposite have attempted to analyse the majority of the present House. They have analysed it first on its composition in the House of Commons, secondly on its composition in the country, and thirdly on the kind of pledges by which it was returned. I am not the least afraid to follow hon. Gentlemen opposite in every one of those examinations. The more its composition is analysed the better pleased we shall be with it. The First Lord of the Treasury was a Member of the Fourth Party during the Parliament of 1880 to 1885. I would recall to mind the great Party Division in this House in the end of June, 1885. We all remember the historic scene. There were 252 Liberals then in power and 264 the combined Opposition. The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) was then a little younger, and he was, perhaps, a little merrier than he is now; and we all remember how he stood up on the first seat below the Gangway and waved his hat like an Eton schoolboy escaped for his holidays, and he was followed by other Members of the Tory Party. A short time afterwards the new Administration was formed, and the right hon. Gentleman the present First Lord of the Treasury then got upon the first step of the official ladder, up which he has since climbed so high. Did the right hon. Gentleman, who was then Secretary for Scotland, and his distinguished relative the Prime Minister, analyse the majority by which the Liberal Government was turned out of Office? There were 252 Liberals and 264 combined Opposition, as I have said; 219 were Conservatives, four were Liberals, and forty-one Irish Nationalist Members. The majority was twelve, and the forty-one Irish Members helped the right hon. Gentleman to get it. I will not presume to intrude upon the secrets of the interviews between incoming Ministers and the Sovereign, but I would ask—did the

First Lord of the Treasury refuse to tyrannise, by means of the Irish brigade, over the declared will of the English constituencies, which still, by a large majority, supported the Liberal Party that had been turned out of power? The right hon. Gentleman wants now to know the terms which have been arrived at between the Liberal Party and the Irish Nationalists. Mr. Speaker, there are no terms. Attempts have been made to analyse the votes recorded at the recent Election in this country. I am not unwilling to go into that question. I say that the majority in this House does not adequately represent the majority of votes given in the country, still less the majority of voters. I will give a few figures in support of that statement. In 1886 the Unionists had a majority of 76,000 votes, which was represented by a majority of 116 Members in this House. In 1892 the Home Rule Party had a majority of 227,000 votes, which is represented by a beggarly majority of forty. When we analyse the votes given in the country we find that they do not always mean voters. I have extracted from the *Standard* newspaper the case of an ancient plural voter of ninety-four years of age, which it had taken from another newspaper. It says—

"On Monday last he left his residence for St. Leonards, voted there, and journeyed back to Kent; voted there, and proceeded to Taunton on the Wednesday; voted there, and returned to Stroud on the Thursday, where he recorded his vote on the Friday morning."

The *Standard* then makes this comment—

"If every Conservative was as enthusiastic and as energetic as this venerable old gentleman, we should not hear of so many constituencies being sacrificed for small majorities to the followers of Home Rule."

I quite agree with the *Standard* newspaper in regard to that; but I will give you a case from my own personal experience. A man confided to a friend of mine the fact that he had given his sixteenth vote, that on the following day he was going to give his seventeenth, and that he would wind up the Election by giving his eighteenth vote on the day after. We all know that that kind of thing has taken place all over the country. What happened in

the Stretford Division of Lancashire? A large number of freeholders in Salford and Manchester were dumped down to South-East Lancashire, which has been sub-divided, and which was then represented by Mr. William Agnew, who I am sorry not to see here again. The result, as I am informed, was that there were not less than 6,305 freeholders who voted on the property qualification, and of these 4,892 were non-resident in the constituency, whilst the majority for the Member elected was 1,345. We now see what the *Standard* means when it says that if every Conservative was as enthusiastic and as energetic as the venerable old gentleman referred to, we should not hear of so many constituencies being sacrificed by small majorities to the followers of Home Rule. I could bring forward other instances as scandalous as this if necessary, but even then I should not have told half the case with regard to the manner in which the majorities were won. We know it is easier for wealthy men to get and retain twenty votes than for the working man to get one and retain it. We know that in constituency after constituency artizans have been disfranchised, not by tens or scores, but by hundreds and by thousands; and I contend that the Liberal Party will not discharge its duty to the nation, and especially to the working classes, if it does not put an end to this wicked and iniquitous anomaly. Take the case also of the register. The right hon. Gentleman and his Party deliberately arranged that the Election should take place on the old instead of on the new register. The choice on the next occasion will not, however, rest with the right hon. Gentleman and his friends. It is interesting to analyse the methods by which the Unionist candidates appealed for support in their Election. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Bury fought his Election on the gratitude of the textile workers, who by a singular coincidence presented to him a testimonial for his efforts on their behalf. But that was not his only cry. A man named Schofield died in Bury, leaving a large amount of property. The people of Bury naturally wished to obtain a share of the wealth which he had made in

their town, and they asked for £7,000 for the purposes of a recreation ground. By another singular and most fortunate coincidence the matter was finally settled within a few weeks of the Election in Bury, and the right hon. Gentleman was able to demand a renewal of the confidence of the electors of Bury on the ground that he had received a letter stating that the £7,000 would be given for the recreation ground. That is a matter to be explained either by the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the Secretary to the Treasury. I have a placard here which also shows the "Reasons why working men should vote for Quilter" in the Sudbury Division of Suffolk. The first reason was that he had been most generous in contributing towards the Convalescent Home for poor people at Felixtowe; the second, that he had contributed towards an idiot asylum at Colchester; the third, that he had been a generous donor to St. Leonard's Hospital at Sudbury; the fourth, that he had been a true friend to the poor throughout the Division; and another that he had obtained numerous allotments for working men. Other reasons are also given showing that he had been a generous contributor to benevolent movements in the Division, whether connected with the Church of England or with Nonconformists. The Eight Hours Question has also been used by some Unionist candidates for Election purposes. My right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle has been attacked for the manly stand he made with regard to that question, and no doubt many Tory Members were delighted to find that Mr. Broadhurst has been excluded from the House for the same reason. I do not entirely share Mr. Broadhurst's views on the question, but he had his opinions with regard to it, and he had a right to stand by them. The gentleman who displaced him is now in the House not as an enemy to Home Rule, but as a supporter of the eight hours movement. Then there is the case of Mr. Hermon-Hodge. He began as an enemy to legislative restriction to eight hours, but when he was told that that would not do, with manly courage he came out a few days afterwards in favour of such a legislative restriction. I am reminded also of the case of the

*Mr. T. P. O'Connor*

hon. Member for South Tyrone. We raised in this Parliament the question of compulsory purchase in Ireland. The hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) manfully spoke against it, and he denounced it, and I think he voted against it; but when he went to South Tyrone he found that unless he supported compulsory purchase he had no chance of being returned. The hon. Gentleman was equal to the occasion. He did not hesitate—he swallowed compulsory purchase. The Chancellor of the Exchequer gave last night a list of the ways in which the wicked Liberals got into power, and he said it was the Machiavellian whisper about the dear loaf and the cheap loaf which did more for them than the question of Home Rule. In one of the Divisions of Sheffield it was fought on Protection, and we cannot doubt that if they had their way they would have Protection to-morrow. The head of the Government is a Protectionist. His speech at Hastings, on the eve of the Elections, was Protectionist, and I have no hesitation in saying that if they had the power they have the will to introduce laws by which a dear loaf would be substituted for a cheap one. But what I said I spoke of the Party in general. That is my complaint. The Tory Party is a Protectionist and Fair Trade Party in one constituency, and a Free Trade Party in another. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen), quoting, spoke about a Mephistophelian whisper of a cheap loaf having more to do with the success of the Government in the counties than the Irish Question. I am afraid that is so, and I will read a placard which was issued in the Devizes Division of Wilts. The placard was headed—

“Cheap Loaf,”

and went on—

“Who has given it you? The Unionist Government, of which Mr. Long is a Member. When was bread so cheap as now? Vote for Long.”

Unfortunately that statement was neither Mephistophelian nor a whisper, and the electors did not vote for Long. They fought the Elections in some parts of Manchester on Bi-metallism; they fought Macclesfield on Fair Trade. Some of the Divisions of Liverpool were fought on Free Trade, and Mid-

lothian was fought on the question of Church Establishment in Scotland. Even in the same city they have had a different set of principles for different constituencies. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, for instance, does not take the taxation of ground values as one of the articles of his creed. It would not do in St. George's, Hanover Square. But he will have to look after some of his friends, for some of the Tory candidates in the more eastern boroughs were quite ready to declare that it was a monstrous fabrication to say that the Tory Party had any objection to tax ground landlords. But they charge us with having kept Home Rule in the background: I charge them with having put beer very much in the foreground. I have a placard here in which the electors are advised not to vote for a Liberal candidate, because he would vote for Sunday Closing and thus take away from the working man the chance of having his beer with his Sunday's dinner. Here is another placard which reads like the Litany—

“Who would shut up the working man's public-house on the Sunday? Mr. Oscar Browning.”

This placard was issued in the interests of a young Member of this House, who has just become one of the supporters of the Liberal Unionist Whips.

“Who would prevent the working man having a glass of beer at all? Mr. Oscar Browning.”

Who would take good care he did not go without his own? Mr. Oscar Browning.

Who has a club where he can get what he wants at any time, Sundays included? Mr. Oscar Browning.”

This is very much like that popular story of our youth—*My Mother*.

“Who would deprive every publican in the land of his livelihood? Mr. Oscar Browning.”

“If you like and mean to have your beer in moderation, don't vote for Mr. Oscar Browning.”

That is in defence of the integrity of the Empire. The right hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Morley) had an experience which, I dare say, was shared by many Members on this side of the House. He was confronted with a cartoon, where there were two pictures in contrast. On one side, as a bloated member of a club—who, I gather, was supposed to represent my



right hon. Friend—who was comfortably ordering a magnum of port wine, whatever that may be, and on the other side was a picture of a poor working man at his Sunday dinner, and his child had come back with an empty jug, declaring that the public-houses are closed, and that he cannot have his beer. I here express a hope, Mr. Speaker, that before this Parliament comes to an end it will be made impossible for a working man, or anyone else, to send his child to the public-house. Sunday Closing is a legitimate issue, and I do not find fault with hon. Gentlemen opposite for putting it forward; but what I do find fault with is that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who must know these facts as well as I do, should have the courage to come forward in this House and say that the Liberal Party put Home Rule in the background, and falsely imply that the Tory Party put Home Rule in the front. No, Mr. Speaker; it was the beer barrel they put in the foreground. The second charge I make is that the Tory Party were not satisfied with denouncing temperance legislation. I charge against them that they were not satisfied with denouncing the refusal to supply beer on Sundays, but that beer flowed freely and universally for the consumption of the electors. Some months ago I was talking to an hon. Member whom I met in a train, and I expressed the opinion that in the then coming Election the publicans would flood the country with beer. I was too true a prophet. I know that some of these charges will be brought before the tribunals of the country, amongst others the circumstances under which the First Lord of the Treasury obtained a victory in East Manchester. (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear!) If the right hon. Member looks forward to that investigation with confidence, I may say that I look forward with confidence as well. I shall not allude to it further than to say that the right hon. Gentleman is acquainted with a gentleman named Chesters Thompson. A lively debate has taken place in the Manchester City Council with regard to Mr. Chesters Thompson. Mr. Chesters Thompson is a gentleman on whom the right hon. Gentleman has lavished

so much of the language of eulogy as he had left from praising the Resident Magistrates in Ireland. Mr. Chesters Thompson was charged before the City Council with having used some offensive language which I cannot repeat in this House without being very properly called to Order. He denied that he had used the expletives which, I believe, are common in the bibulous conversation of smoke-rooms, but he was compelled to admit that he did say—

“I have told you what I think of you (this to a fellow-alderman); you are a liar; you are a beastly liar; you are a cowardly liar, and I brand you as a liar, and wherever I meet you and wherever you meet me you can think, ‘That is Chesters Thompson, who believes me to be a liar!’”

This is the patron of the right hon. Gentleman, who is so finnickin in the selection of his society that he is ashamed to find himself in the same Lobby with the Irish Members unless they are voting to give him the Irish Secretaryship. I charge against them that not in one or two or in twelve constituencies, but in scores, beer was distributed freely. I charge that in one constituency beer was distributed gratuitously from carts which passed through the streets on the eve of the poll. In another constituency—indeed in many—either on the polling day, or immediately before, beer was supplied at one penny per quart. I charge that in many parts of the country barrels of beer were put into the houses of private men, and electors were allowed to visit these houses and get the beer free of charge, and that was done in the interest of the publican party and of the Tory candidate. I read in a journal in the West of England that in one constituency, on the polling day, a clergyman of the Church of England arranged that a cask of beer should be stationed near the polling booth in a rural parish, and to all who would accept it liquor was dispensed by a man in the service of the clergyman. The clergyman was a Unionist. I have yet to learn that any action for libel has been taken against that paper. I have it on the authority of the Member for East Bradford (Mr. Caine) that on the polling day men—strangers to the constituency—were stationed at nearly every public-house

*Mr. T. P. O'Connor*

in the Division and supplied beer to the voters. After the Election these men, to avoid identification, vanished into thin air, where the Judges cease from troubling and bribers are at rest. I solemnly ask this House, is that the way in which an Election should be fought? Was it for such practices as this that Act after Act has been passed in this House to put down corrupt practices? Hon. Gentlemen opposite claim to be defenders of the unity of the Empire. It is a noble idea, but it is my idea as well as theirs. It is the idea of every man on this side of the House; but I would scorn, even in the interests of the unity of the Empire, to win an Election by wholesale debauchery and wholesale corruption.

\*(6.47.) MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): It is, no doubt, entirely in accordance with the fitness of things that a member of a Party whose proudest boast it is that they are political mercenaries, and have turned out a Liberal Government as they now propose to turn out a Unionist Government, should take into their special keeping the consistency of hon. Members of this House; and it is also very proper that an hon. Member who, although he has been in the House more than a dozen years, never gave a vote in favour of the Sunday closing of public-houses, and never gave one atom of support to the temperance movement in his life, should express a hope that this Parliament will take the matter in hand; and I think it is still more proper that a Member of that Party, many Members of which have obtained their seats by the foulest priestly intimidation, should now stand up in this House and call in question actions at English Elections. I am thankful that the hon. Member for the Scotland Division (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) spoke before I had an opportunity of rising to take part in a Debate that concerns the Province of Ulster more deeply than it concerns any other portion of the Empire. Hon. Members have been discussing what is to be the nature of the Home Rule Bill; but, compared with the people the Ulster Members represent,

they have merely an academic interest in the question. We have a burning interest in it. I think the most remarkable feature in this Debate is not the speech of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith), or anything that has been said at all, but what the right hon. Member for Midlothian left unsaid in regard to the speech of the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond). That was either an intentional omission, or it was not. The right hon. Gentleman either accidentally omitted to refer to that speech, or he intended to give it the go-by. It was not the first time that the hon. Member for Waterford had delivered an inconvenient speech; it is not the first time that this Front Bench has burked the speech and retired from the House, and tonight I call the pointed attention of the House to the fact that a most important speech by a Member who represents at least 70,000 electors in Ireland has been deliberately let alone by the right hon. Gentleman who I suppose will be Prime Minister of England next week. I want to contrast the statement made by the hon. Member for Waterford with one which the right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) made only six months ago. The hon. Member for Waterford treated the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament as a mere figment, and said that he would only recognise a technical supremacy. That speech was not answered, and I ask the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton is that the kind of supremacy he meant when he spoke at Rawtenstall to the electors of Rossendale in January last? He did not say then anything like what is said by the hon. Member for Waterford. The hon. Member for Waterford said that if the Irish Parliament exceeded its functions there would be a Supreme Court to call it in question and restrain it. That certainly was not the definition of supremacy laid down by the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton. Speaking in Rossendale he said—

"If the Irish Parliament did attempt to interfere with or violate one of the fundamental bases of the Constitution, then the Imperial Parliament would be the shield of every man, woman, and child throughout the Queen's Dominions."

Why did not the right hon. Member for Midlothian answer the hon. Member for Waterford on the floor of this House in the presence of Parliament in the sense of the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton? There were electors to be won at Rossendale, but the votes have been squared here. As regards the other point raised by the hon. Member for Waterford, the question of the veto, what is his proposal? It offers no protection at all to the minority in Ireland. It was to be the veto of the Crown, acting on the advice of Irish Ministers—that is to say, the Members for Mayo, for North Meath, and for Louth, when they have got through their Election Petitions. At present we are left in this position—that the attitude taken up by the hon. Member for Waterford is unchallenged by the Opposition Front Bench. The English, Scotch, and Welsh Members have an academic interest in this Debate. Our all depends on it in Ulster, and in asking for further information from the Front Bench we are not exceeding our duty in the slightest degree. The hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy) made a remarkable speech, and if I were to describe that speech in the words of the hon. Gentleman who formerly sat for North Longford (Mr. Timothy Healy) I should say that it was a put-up job. Does the hon. Member for North Longford, or anyone else in the House, imagine that the evicted tenants are going to be put off with an inquiry? Does anyone imagine that the evicted tenants will be satisfied with the language of the right hon. Member for Midlothian in a letter he wrote the other day to the secretary of a society who takes an interest in the evicted tenants, that this was a subject that it would be well to bring into public view? These evicted tenants have been out for six years, and what I wish to impress on the House is that every right hon. Gentleman on the Front Bench voted last Session for a Bill to give greater privileges to these evicted tenants than ordinary tenants in Ireland possess. If the scheme they voted for is carried out there is no reason why any tenant in Ireland should ever pay rent again. The right hon. Member for Midlothian

*Mr. T. W. Russell*

used language of the most ominous kind with regard to these evicted tenants. He said he hoped, in the interval between now and next Session, this matter would be fully considered in Ireland, and he added that perhaps the landlords of those farms would be well advised if they came to a settlement. How will the Irish evicted tenants interpret that? They will say that protection is to be withdrawn from those farms where it exists. Now, I say that the only result of that will be outrage on a large scale. I do not envy the task of the Chief Secretary in dealing with those evicted tenants, even though he may have a telephone between Drumcondra Palace and Dublin Castle. What, again, are we to understand by the statement that the new Government will govern Ireland according to public opinion in Ireland? Public opinion in Ireland during the last thirteen years has been expressed in favour of boycotting and in favour of coercing every man who differed from the majority. Is that to be the way in which the law is to be administered in Ireland? Public opinion in some parts of Ireland has run in the direction of attacking landlords. Is that to be the direction of the future Government? We have by no means got to the end of this question, and probably the new Government will find the problems awaiting them in Ireland more difficult than the framing of a Home Rule Bill. But, Sir, apart from the speeches delivered by Irish Members, there was a speech delivered by the hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith). Of course he spoke from his brief, and it was his desire, plainly intimated, to narrow the discussion to the narrowest limits, but there was one thing he could not resist. He could not resist a fling at the Liberal Unionists. I do not forget, however, that these gentlemen were long ago doomed to extinction. It is now only a question in the rule of three how long we are to last, but then we were not to be here at all. And, the prophecies of last Parliament having come to naught, we are not inclined to attach any importance to the prophecies of the present. The hon. and learned Member said that the Liberal Unionists had dwindled from ninety-three to forty-seven, and he

added that it was a simple sum of arithmetic to decide when the end would come. But, Mr. Speaker, there are other dwindling Parties as well as Liberal Unionists. We were called apostates. All I have to say is, there must be a considerable number of apostates in East Fife. In the year 1885 the Radical Member was returned for my native constituency of East Fife with a majority of close upon two thousand. Now the hon. and learned Member has just scraped in by two hundred. There must also be a considerable number of apostates all over Scotland. Look at the position of the hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire (Dr. Farquharson). He has managed to reduce a majority of 2,100 to one of eighty. Then the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) has performed a feat worthy of a heaven-born statesman, because he has almost destroyed the Gladstonian majority in its very citadel. Let me remind the hon. Member for East Fife that there are other dwindling quantities in politics, and that probably the artizans of East Fife, whom he has treated much as if they were agricultural labourers of the South of England, will have something to say to him if he goes back for re-election. Now, Sir, the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) has entertained this House with details of how the English Elections were won. I am going to inform the House, as a set-off, how some Irish Elections have been won. It is a pretty picture of this down-trodden country. If you have publicans in England we have priests in Ireland. Let me call the attention of the House, not to newspaper statements, but to statements from gentlemen who had the honour of sitting in this House in the last Parliament. Many of the old Members of this House will remember Mr. Corbet, the late Member for East Wicklow, who was no carpet-bagger imported from any part of England to that constituency. He was a resident there, and had been twice elected. But he has now been rejected; and let us hear what he has to say as to the cause of his defeat. Sir, I quote not from a Unionist newspaper but from a

Nationalist newspaper — the *Daily Independent*—of the 23rd July. In this newspaper Mr. Corbet is reported to have said—

“In Ireland the Ballot Act and the extension of the franchise have not secured freedom of election. There is no use mincing matters. Under episcopal and clerical influence, the exercise of the franchise has become a mockery and a farce, and unless a Rescript from Rome, or, failing that, an Act of Parliament from Westminster, puts a stop to the personal interference of priests at elections, save as regards the exercise of their own legitimate civil rights, Mr. Speaker might just as well issue his Writs to the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland instead of to the High Sheriffs, and the franchise might as well be confined to the clergy themselves.”

You condemn publicans and beer. Heaven knows I have nothing to say in favour of either. They played no part in my election, and I am not responsible for other people. What has the hon. Member for the Scotland Division to say to this priestly influence? I tell him that there are scarcely a score of seats south of the Boyne which, if submitted to a Court of Law, would not result in the unseating of the Members who have been elected for that part of Ireland. Take another hon. Member. I differed from him widely. He, at all events, had no fear of beer, because he was its great advocate in this House. I refer to Mr. John O'Connor, who formerly sat for Tipperary. What does he say of this influence? He says—

“I have no doubt the day will come when we shall reverse the verdict of yesterday, but if we do not stand together and organise, it will be as well to abandon all representation, to give up the show and mockery, and to hand over an emasculated Ireland to the Bishops and priests of the country.”

What does my hon. Friend the Member for West Bradford (Mr. Illingworth), who represents the dissidence of political dissent, think of this? And, Sir, these statements are not confined to men who have been in this House. I take Canon O'Mahony. This rev. gentleman, speaking in Cork in the presence of Mr. Maurice Healy, said—

“In view of this further development of Parnellism, I wonder is there anyone in this city who thinks that it was going too far to say it was a crime, a sin, a mortal sin of the deepest dye, to vote for them or support them in any way.”

How is language like this construed by the Irish peasant? He is told that he commits a mortal sin in voting for Parnellism. Is that promoting freedom of election? Everyone knows what the effect of such language must be. I will go further, and take a Pastoral issued by Dr. Nulty, the Bishop of Meath, where, I ought to remind the House, a Petition has been lodged against the hon. Member who was returned. Imagine the effect of this language upon the peasant before the Election. The Bishop says—

"It is through our preaching and teaching—the Catholic Bishops and Priests—alone that the faithful receive the Divine faith and knowledge, without which they cannot be saved. It is exclusively through us that the clean and holy oblation of the sacrifice of the Mass is offered daily for the living and the dead on the thousands of altars throughout our country. It is through our ministry that the poor penitent gets forgiveness of his sins in the Sacrament of Penance. The dying Parnellite himself will hardly dare to face the justice of his Creator till he has been prepared and anointed by us for the last awful struggle and for the terrible judgment that will immediately follow it."

Talk about beer, talk about publicans! Why, it is mere child's play compared with this state of things. And let us go further. This priestly interference is not even confined to influence of a spiritual character. Let this House understand now that there are two Roman Catholic priests committed for trial for assault at the door of polling booths. One of these reverend gentlemen knocked down an old man named Reilly, seventy-three years of age, outside a polling booth, and if the House will permit me I will read a delicious extract I have here, showing what a policeman thought of it. The sergeant of police, giving evidence at Navan, stated that the old man said to the priest—

"I want no instruction or direction from you, Father Clarke. I know myself better what to do than you can tell me."

Was not that a proper sentiment to come from an elector even to a clergyman? What right had the clergyman to stand outside the polling booth at all and interfere with the freedom of election? And the sergeant added—

"I then cautioned Reilly to stop making use of such expressions."

*Mr. T. W. Russell*

That will convey to hon. Members the terrorism that prevails in Ireland at election times. There are two parish priests committed for trial for physical violence at these elections, and there is one, Father Heany, who has escaped by the leniency of the magistrate—a man who, absolutely without the slightest provocation, knocked the hon. Member for North Galway (Colonel Nolan) senseless in the streets. The hon. Member for the Scotland Division (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) was very witty about plural voting, and he gave a graphic description of a man who had voted sixteen or seventeen times. I have a list of twelve men here who at the Election for West Belfast tried to vote for dead men, and they got six weeks' imprisonment each for it. And it is because these men were discovered that the hon. Member for North Kerry (Mr. Sexton) is not the Member for West Belfast. I think it is, at all events, better for living men to vote sixteen times than for dead men to be voted once. And I have here a description of a scene at Louth—the seat won by the real Leader of the Irish Party. A man was killed, and at the trial a young lad absolutely confessed that he had attended the Roman Catholic chapel on Sunday night, and, acting under instructions given there, he had tried to personate his grandfather, who had been dead many years. Plural voting is not in it with this. And then look at the question of illiteracy. Take East Wicklow, the seat lost by Mr. Corbet. In 1885, 357 illiterates polled, and in 1892 education had gone so far back that 1,008 illiterates polled, and the astonishing thing, Mr. Speaker, is that only ten were cast for Mr. Corbet, while the rest went for Mr. Sweetman. These men were no more illiterate than I am. They were made so to vote, and "I vote public" has now become a well-known phrase. They wanted it to be known how they voted, and so they voted as illiterates. There is another question to which I must allude—we are now to have the Crimes Act repealed. I am exceedingly sorry that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) has disappeared, because I have what he would consider a very apposite quotation from one of

his Scotch speeches. There was a time when the right hon. Gentleman was Chief Secretary for Ireland, and he learned a little during the few months he was at Dublin Castle. The Tories were trying to govern Ireland by the ordinary law, and the Liberals were exceedingly angry at them for attempting it; and here, speaking in Stirling to his constituents, is what the right hon. Gentleman said—

"The key of the whole of this question was this—that in many parts of Ireland, for certain classes of offences, especially offences of an agrarian character, they could not trust to the ordinary class of jurymen doing their duty, partly from ignorance, partly from prejudice, but mainly owing to the cruel and overpowering system of terror under the National League."

That is rough on hon. Members below the Gangway—

"They could not be sure, with the clearest evidence, of being able to get a verdict. Now he maintained that in order to uphold the arm of justice in Ireland it was not merely reasonable, but necessary, to provide some measures which could overcome that difficulty, and it might very well have been made part of the permanent law."

And yet the right hon. Gentleman I suppose, when the time comes, will follow his Leader into the Lobby for repealing an Act which was not operative, and the best portion of which he was ready in 1885 to see made part of the ordinary law. Mr. Speaker, there have been arguments, and there will continue to be arguments, as to the scope of the Home Rule Bill. But, whatever may be the nature of that measure, it can have only one meaning for the people of Ulster. It means their degradation as citizens. It will place their religious freedom, purchased at a great price, at the mercy of Archbishop Walsh. It will place their civil rights, wrung from Kings, at the disposal of the most unscrupulous body of politicians that Ireland has ever produced. It will place the commerce of Ulster at the mercy of men, some of whom have converted the smiling and prosperous town of Tipperary into a howling wilderness, and who, to carry out the basest of ends, have not scrupled to lay waste and bare great tracts of country, and to turn smiling fields into waste and desert places. This, and much more, any form of Home

Rule will mean to Ulster. Fortunately, by means of the appeal to the country, the views of Ulster at least cannot now be mistaken. The issue of the Election as regards that Province cannot be doubted. You were wont to boast in the old Parliament that the Representatives of Ulster sat below the Gangway. You then had seventeen Nationalists and sixteen Unionists. You have now fourteen Nationalists and nineteen Unionists. Wherever else you have been successful you have utterly failed in that Province. You laid your plans with the greatest care. Yes; whatever kind of Home Rule the hon. and learned Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond) may be in favour of, I know the kind of Home Rule that was dangled before the people of Ulster. The words were never mentioned there. It was called a reform of local government. It was called a reform of Dublin Castle administration, and Heaven knows what except Home Rule. You baited it with agrarian socialism, you tempted the electors with remission of taxation, and you pleaded the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone)—and I am free to admit here that that name is still a power in that Province. The people in some parts of Ulster have not forgotten that they went to bed slaves one night and arose free men. You pleaded the name of the right hon. Gentleman, but behind that illustrious name there was the mantle of Archbishop Walsh, and the language of the hon. Member for North Louth (Mr. Timothy Healy). This was enough for Ulster men. Whatever form the Home Rule Bill may take, this, at all events, the Imperial Parliament may rely upon—that the Province of Ulster will resist it to the death, and in the language of the chairman of that great Convention in Belfast, "Ulster will have no Home Rule."

\*SIR HENRY MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Stafford, Handsworth): The hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) has been kind enough to accuse the Unionist Party of winning their victories at this Election by beer, and

by keeping Home Rule in the background. Now, Sir, I have the honour to inform the hon. Gentleman that, in one constituency in England at least, Home Rule was kept continually in the foreground, and with the most satisfactory results. In the constituency I represent there was a majority of nearly three thousand in support of the right hon. Member for Midlothian in 1885, but that majority has now been converted into a minority of nearly two thousand. Does the hon. Member for the Scotland Division think that a majority of three thousand could be converted into a minority of two thousand by beer alone? I have listened with great attention to the speech of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith), and also to the speech of the right hon. Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), and I cannot say I learned much from either of them. But this much I learned—that both these hon. Gentlemen thought that, at the first blast of the trumpet given by the hon. Member for East Fife, the walls of Jericho should fall down and the Members of the Opposition should at once walk into the citadel of office they have so long and ardently desired. And I think the House will allow that if the walls of Jericho did not fall down it was not because the hon. Member did not blow his own trumpet loud enough. After that the hon. Member for East Fife proceeded to read us a homily, not on the whole duty of man, but on the whole duty of the Unionist Party, and according to him the duty of the Unionist Party, when they are returned to Office, as they were in 1885, is to fold their arms and refuse to do anything. They were to decline to carry any of the measures which the country really cared about, as the Separatist Party alone, according to him, had the monopoly of attempting to pass beneficent legislation. Now, Sir, he passed from that to accuse the Party I belong to of political apostacy. That charge, however, does not annoy me in the least. It is a charge that can be easily replied to. If you are to be an apostate from anything it must be from something in existence, and from some article or creed of political faith.

*Sir Henry Meysey-Thompson*

Now, Sir, I assert that Home Rule had no existence as an article of the Liberal creed prior to 1886, and therefore it is perfectly impossible that anyone could apostasise from a thing that had no existence whatever. This afternoon the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian said it was moral force that brought the Irish Question into the position it now occupies. I am bound to say, as a Member of the Liberal Unionist Party, that in my opinion that is not so. I and my colleagues believe that it was motive force, and not moral force—the motive force possessed by Mr. Parnell and his followers of turning Ministries out of Office—that has effected the change. We all remember the extravagant expectations held out to us if the Home Rule Bill were passed. Crime was to cease; peace and prosperity were to prevail; the Irish were to cease from coveting each other's property; and like the conclusion of a three volume novel—only in this case it was to end with divorce instead of a wedding—everyone was to live happily ever after. But when we escaped from the glamour of the right hon. Gentleman's eloquence—when we sat down quietly to consider what was the state of the case, we soon saw that we were not in the position of a fairy godmother scattering illimitable gifts from an inexhaustible treasury, but that we were sent here as men of business to act as trustees for the best interests of England, Scotland, Wales, and, as long as the present Union lasts, of Ireland also. The hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond) alluded to the subject himself, and he said that the financial part of the Bill was the *cruz* of the whole affair. In not arguing that question he, perhaps, showed a wise discretion. However, I intend to allude to it myself, as it is evident from what the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) said this afternoon that he has not the slightest intention to make any change in his Bill in that respect. He alluded to Clause 4 of the Local Government Bill introduced by the present Government, and I am bound to say that he did not refer to it in what we may call terms of unlimited approval. When he spoke on this.

subject at Edinburgh in the beginning of July he said—

"I say, in my judgment, that it was the grossest and most wanton insult ever offered by a Legislature to a people."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) did not leave this long un-criticised, because the very next day he pointed out that the expenditure of money, to the limitation of which, by reference to the Grand Jury, the right hon. Gentleman objected so strongly, only had reference to capital expenditure. I believe the Government inserted this restraining clause entirely for the benefit of Ireland—to prevent County Councils running their counties into debt and embarrassment. If the right hon. Gentleman is so extremely anxious that County Councils in Ireland should be allowed to run into debt to the utmost of their ability, it is clear that he does not intend to leave out of his Home Rule Bill the allowance of unrestricted borrowing by the authorities in Ireland. We might have thought that Ireland was to start with a very respectable National Debt, seeing that, in the apportionment which was made in 1886, she was to have at the outset a National Debt of over forty millions. The right hon. Gentleman, in his introduction of that Bill, spoke of the credit of Ireland as being an infant. That may be so, but I cannot avoid the thought that there is considerable ground for the belief that this infant may develop into a youthful Hercules, capable of strangling with one hand the agricultural prosperity of the South and West, and with the other the commercial prosperity of Ulster and the North. On one point I agree with the right hon. Gentleman. He said he thought it extremely probable that the Irish authorities would desire to borrow money for useful purposes. I quite agree with him in that, but I go further. I say it would be absolutely necessary for the Irish authorities to borrow money, and for this reason. You would have men in office who have been for years exciting the feelings of the most ignorant of the Irish population by promises of the grand things they are to have under Home Rule. A Parliament in Ireland would, perhaps, be able to change the law, but changing the law does not put money into the

pockets of the people. The only way to produce a fictitious prosperity would be by borrowing large sums of money and spending them in the country. The right hon. Gentleman used the word "useful" in this connection, but the word is vague and unsatisfactory. If useful means remunerative—that is to say, that the money borrowed and expended is likely to produce a good return—then I beg to differ entirely from the right hon. Gentleman; because we know that individuals and corporations and companies borrow money and expend it on their property in the hope of increasing their income, and have often failed entirely to do so. In such cases the considerations have only been commercial, but in the case of Ireland there could be no such limit. They would have to give political considerations the first place in the determination of the expenditure of the money. I do not believe that a combination of commercial and political aims in borrowing and spending money will be likely to increase the income of Ireland in anything like so large a degree as the income would be diminished by the interest they would have to pay on the money. We must also remember that this might be aggravated by the power given to Ireland to issue Bank notes. I am quite aware that the right hon. Gentleman said they would not have the power of dealing with currency and legal tender; but a free hand as to Bank notes would render the restriction of currency a dead letter. We are all aware that it is very easy to print Bank notes and to issue them, and it is also very easy by legislation to make them legal tender; but the difficulty begins when you have to redeem the promises you made when issuing these notes, and we know, also, that these promises can only be met by a proper reserve of gold to meet the notes when they are presented. Even the Bank of England has at times difficulty in maintaining a sufficient stock of gold, and in times of panic there is always talk of suspending the Bank Act, and permitting the issue of notes in excess of the legal regulations. Suppose, in time of panic and difficulty, the Irish State Bank issued notes in excess of the amount of gold ready to redeem them, could



England interfere in any way? I do not think she would be able to do so. If notes fell to a discount, you would be at once landed in difficulties of the most complicated nature, because we have undertaken responsibilities in connection with our legislation in Ireland. For instance, we have deprived the landlords of the control of their property; we have made them mere rent-chargers. And having taken away the control of a man's property, you are bound to see that the rent-charge is fully paid in lawful money. But suppose that Irish notes fell to the proportion of two £1 notes being required to procure £1 gold. Then take the case of a £50 per year tenant, who to procure gold would, at this rate, have to pay £100 in notes. How would you persuade that tenant that you had not suddenly doubled his rent? And, supposing the tenant will only pay £50 in notes, I want to know who will make good the difference to the landlord? Is it to be Ireland, or is it to be England only? This is a question which undoubtedly affects England and Scotland and Wales, because there is nothing more certain than that, if Ireland gets into great financial difficulties either on account of over-borrowing or the issue of Bank notes until they go to a discount, there will immediately arise an agitation against payment of the money due annually from Ireland to England. And if financial difficulties were to go so far that we had to resume the government of Ireland, we should have to take the responsibility of Irish debts. When the Unionist Party is attacked in reference to Ireland they are quite prepared to defend themselves. In place of the scheme to be offered by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, I am prepared to proceed in this matter in the old English manner of acting tentatively. I wish to see Local Government brought in somewhat on the lines of the Bill introduced this summer by the present Government, and I wish to see the Irish nation accept such a Bill. I want them to work it successfully, and to show us that they can conduct their Local Government in such a manner as to make it the model and the admiration of the world. I should like to see the Irish nation send Representatives

here who would be the flower of the intellect and education of the country. And I should like to see these Representatives apply themselves as energetically and as ably to the framing and carrying out of measures for the benefit of this country as they have hitherto done in obstructing them. I am quite sure if they did this that Parliament and the country would be willing to grant them much greater concessions than they will ever wring from an unwilling House and an unwilling country, especially in a House composed as this one is, where there is a strong and powerful fighting minority—strong not only in the confidence of their constituents, but also in the knowledge that the large majority of the Members and also the electors of England are strongly opposed to Home Rule.

\*MR. D. NAOROJI (Finsbury, Central): It may be considered rather rash and unwise on my part to stand before this House so immediately after my admission here; and my only excuse is that I am under a certain necessity to do so. My election for an English constituency is a unique event. For the first time during more than a century of settled British rule an Indian is admitted into this House as a Member for an English constituency. That, as I have said, is a unique event in the history of India, and, I may also venture to say, in the history of the British Empire. I desire to say a few words in analysis of this great and wonderful phenomenon. The spirit of the British rule, the instinct of British justice and generosity, from the very commencement, when Parliament seriously took the matter of Indian policy into its hands, about the beginning of this century, decided that India was to be governed on the lines of British freedom and justice. Steps were taken without any hesitation to introduce Western education, civilisation, and political institutions in that country; and the result was that, aided by a noble and grand language, in which the youth of that country began to be educated, a great movement of political life—I may say new life—was infused into a land which had been decaying for centuries. The British rulers of the country endowed it with all their own most

*Sir Henry Meysey-Thompson*

important privileges. A few days ago, Sir, you demanded from the Throne the privileges which belong to the people, including freedom of speech, for which they have fought and shed their blood. That freedom of speech you have given to us, and it enables Indians to stand before you and represent in clear and open language any desire they have felt. By conferring those privileges you have prepared for this final result of an Indian standing before you in this House, becoming a Member of the great Imperial Parliament of the British Empire, and being able to express his views openly and fearlessly before you. The glory and credit of this great event—by which India is thrilled from one end to the other—of the new life, the joy, the ecstasy of India at the present moment, is all your own; it is the spirit of British institutions and the love of justice and freedom in British instincts which has produced this extraordinary result, and I stand here in the name of India to thank the British people that they have made it at all possible for an Indian to occupy this position, and to speak freely in the English language of any grievance which India may be suffering under, with the conviction that, though he stand alone, with only one vote, whenever he is able to bring forward any aspiration, and is supported by just and proper reasons, he will find a large number of other Members from both sides of the House ready to support him and give him the justice he asks. This is the conviction which permeates the whole thinking and educated classes of India. It is that conviction that enables us to work on day after day, without dismay, for the removal of a grievance. The questions now being discussed before the House will come up from time to time in practical shape, and I shall then be able to express my humble views upon them as a Representative of the English constituency of Central Finsbury. I do not intend to enter into them now. Central Finsbury has earned the everlasting gratitude of the millions of India, and has made itself famous in the history of the British Empire, by electing an Indian to represent it. Its name will never be forgotten by India.

This event has strengthened the British power, and the loyalty and attachment of India to it, ten times more than the sending out of one hundred thousand or two hundred thousand European soldiers would have done. The moral force to which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) referred is the golden link by which India is held to the British Power. So long as India is satisfied with the justice and honour of Britain so long will her Indian Empire last, and I have not the least doubt that, though our progress may be slow and we may at times meet with disappointments, if we persevere, whatever justice we ask in reason we shall get. I thank you, Sir, for allowing me to say these few words, and the House for so indulgently listening to me, and I hope that the connection between England and India—which forms five-sixths of the British Empire—may continue long with benefit to both countries. There will be certain Indian questions, principally of administration, which I shall have to lay before the House, and I am quite sure that when they are brought forward they will be fairly considered and, if reasonable, amended to our satisfaction.

\*(8.30.) MR. E. H. HULSE (Salisbury): In rising to oppose the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) I confess I have derived some benefit from hearing this Debate; but I also have had an opportunity during the recent electoral struggle throughout the country of gauging the feelings, not only of an urban constituency with agricultural surroundings, but of villages in the West of England, and of hearing and learning the main point of controversy on which the verdict of the rural constituencies was given. In our large towns, of course, foreign policy has been discussed, but I think the action of the Government has very seldom been criticised. There were but few words of controversy as to the occupation of Egypt, and as to recent troubles with Portugal. The greatest condemnation which has ever been suggested as to the action of Her Majesty's Government has been in reference to the intricate question of Maltese marriages.

Therefore, it seems idle to suggest that the foreign policy of the Advisers of Her Majesty during the past six years has been called in question, much less condemned. I can only trust, if the united action of the opponents of Her Majesty's Government is successful in the crucial Division which will decide the fate of the present Ministry, that, as many of our opponents have had the honesty and the courage to pay a tribute of approval and respect to the foreign policy of Her Majesty's present Advisers during the past six years, and that that policy has been so successful and has secured for Great Britain once more her rightful place in the Councils of Europe—I trust that the policy of continuity which was so gracefully and so gratefully acknowledged by Lord Salisbury, after the short change of Government in 1886, may be the ideal of the statesman who may, for a short time, perhaps, be the successor of Lord Salisbury in the conduct and control of our relations with Foreign Powers. Removing this subject of foreign policy from the sphere of Party controversy, and placing it, as I think very rightly, upon the plane of non-controversial subjects, may I be permitted to express an earnest hope that the national policy of Great Britain may ever be continuous, as it is only thereby that our foreign policy can be successful. During the recent campaign an attempt was made to draw away the consideration of the working classes from the real point at issue, as, for instance, by introducing the old cry of the cheap and the dear loaf; but, except in some of the rural constituencies, such an attempt has been a conspicuous and entire failure. In the rural districts, however, insinuations took the place of arguments, and passion and prejudice have been instilled into the minds of unappreciative and, I am afraid, in many cases uneducated voters. I do not think anyone can deny that the battle in the boroughs has been fought upon the broad issue of the Union, and that Her Majesty's present Advisers have been supported in the great centres of industry; and I believe the House realises that from the verdict of such constituencies as London, Liverpool, and Glasgow, not to mention the verdict of the Midlands,

*Mr. E. H. Hulse*

it is quite clear that, so far as Home Rule is concerned, as an abstract proposition, and on the issue of the establishment of a new and independent Parliament in Dublin the voice of the working men of England has been very distinctly and very decisively heard. What victories have been achieved, and what seats have been lost by the Party to which I have the honour to belong have been won by our opponents upon the Labour Question, and issues other than the disintegration of the Empire, of which Lord Beaconsfield warned us in such eloquent and impassioned language twelve years ago. Every country Member knows that the question of Home Rule was of no interest whatever to the working men so far as the rural population was concerned. They have not—certainly not in the West of England—decided whether they will support a Home Rule scheme when it is submitted to them, for the very simple and sufficient reason that they have not been told what it is. They do not know, and in many cases they do not care to know, and they do not understand what Home Rule is. It was pointed out to the working classes in the country districts that on general principles they should support the Liberal Party, and the grounds for that support which were offered to and accepted by the rural voter have been not political, but social—English, not Irish. The subjects which I myself have found interesting to country audiences have been, without doubt, the improvement of village life, the reform and revision of the Poor Law system, and the subject of which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham is so enlightened an advocate—I mean the provision of old age pensions for the poor. I am afraid that in our country districts there has been controversy of such a character as not to encourage, and certainly not to improve, political discussions in the country. We have had a very amusing speech from the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), and in face of that speech perhaps it would be only right that I should be candid enough to admit that I do not claim perfection for the Party to which I belong. Many times

before has this House witnessed a change of Government and a reversal of policy, but I trust that the House will hesitate before it takes, as I think, the stupendous step of reversing the Irish policy of the Government during the past six years. I hope that we may not witness a return to those dark days, and to the horrors and outrages of the years 1882, 1883, and 1884. Should we not rather prefer measures to men; should we not pursue the policy of Imperial development rather than venture upon an unknown field of internal reorganisation; should we not, to use a homely phrase, act better by leaving well alone? I am confident that many Irishmen believe that Imperial credit is essential to Irish progress and to the development and improvement of Irish industries. Left to her own resources, with dissension among her people, especially on the part of those who possess the capital and the enterprise, it would be folly to assert that the Irish national credit would be equal to, or would in any way be better than, that Imperial credit which Ireland now has the advantage of by partnership with Great Britain, with her vast and boundless resources. I would appeal to hon. Members opposite, before they change places with us, to consider carefully the promises they have made to their constituents. I want to know how they can support the proposition of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife before they know something more definite as to what the Irish policy of their Leaders is to be? The pledges and promises given at election times are, we have been told by a very witty and distinguished Member of the Opposition, very soon wiped out by the tears of the recording angel; but I would remind hon. Members that these promises and pledges are not forgotten in the constituencies or by earnest politicians, who perhaps have been unwilling to throw in their lot with the Liberal Unionist Party, and have contented themselves by asking their candidates to pledge themselves to support only such a scheme of Home Rule as will not lead to separation, and as will not be the

forerunner of the disintegration of this Empire. Over and over again we have heard that the rights of the minority will be protected, but I should like to ask what guarantees have been offered to this House that this will be done? What official suggestions have ever been made by those who desire and expect to be the responsible Ministers of the Crown for the protection of the minorities? As a very young Member of this House, I have watched very carefully the events which have occurred in Ireland during the past few years, and I do appeal most earnestly to Members who sit on the opposite side of the House, not to their political convictions, but to their personal experiences and knowledge of the great benefits accruing from the Irish policy of Her Majesty's Government during the past six years as their guide. I shall look forward with some satisfaction to going into "the cold shades of Opposition." It may, perhaps, be a little more agreeable and preferable to a young Member than constant attendance as a supporter of the Government of the day, and perhaps I may find it will be more congenial to be "in a position of greater freedom and less responsibility;" but I felt I could not record my vote upon issues so momentous and upon questions so grave without taking part in this Debate. I maintain that the attacks upon the Irish policy of Her Majesty's Government have entirely failed in the country, though, of course, the promises which have been made to the rural voters in response to the claims of labour have borne the small fruits of success which the Opposition, in the present position of affairs, now possess. I earnestly trust that in the decision which the House will give upon the point at issue it will be guided by considerations of past experience rather than by what I may fairly call chimerical promises of future gain.

(8.46.) MR. W. KENRICK (Birmingham, N.): We are told by some of those who are prepared to face with full satisfaction the taking that leap in the dark known by the name of Home Rule that they are not going to argue with us or to endeavour to convince us

and that they are to use their majority, such as it is, to silence us. They are to put us down by what they call a "brute vote." We may be silenced, but we shall not be convinced, and certainly not confuted. This majority, which was described the other night by the hon. Member for South Aberdeen (Mr. Bryce) as a small but fighting majority—how was it got together, how was the slender battalion recruited? It seems to me that that is a very pertinent question. It has been raised on both sides of the House, and various explanations and interpretations suiting either Party have been given. I am inclined to inquire whether this majority of forty was really the result of a straight issue put to the people on the question of Home Rule? We all speak with the greatest authority when we speak from our own experience. Well, as regards Birmingham and the Midland Counties, I am free to confess that the issue was put fairly and squarely to the electors both by the Unionist Party and by the Unionist candidates, and what was the result of that appeal to the electors? Why, they rejected Home Rule by an enormous majority! In the Counties of Warwick, Worcester, Stafford, and Shrewsbury, thirty-five Members were sent in opposition to the policy of Home Rule, and only nine Gladstonian Members in support of it. That is, in fact, a majority of four to one condemning the policy of Home Rule. On the other side a great many questions were submitted to the electors, and it is not easy to disentangle the dominant issue. In my constituency my opponent was a Labour candidate and a Home Ruler, but he talked very little about Home Rule, though he expressed the opinion that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) had been spared by Providence to settle the Irish Question. An hon. Member who supported my opponent during the Election argued persuasively that Home Rule, rightly understood, was itself a great Labour question, seeing that it would bring prosperity to Ireland; but what little evidence we have had goes to show that the influence of Home Rule, not as an

actual reality, but as a threatened possibility, has not been to increase the prosperity of Ireland, to give confidence to the commercial classes, or to raise the value of securities, but, on the contrary, to induce the fear that, if it came, every man who has anything to lose in Ireland would, as soon as possible, leave the country and take his capital with him. I am also bound to say that what I have observed in the South West of England confirms the statement that that which was submitted to the electors in that part of the country was the big Liberal loaf against the little Tory loaf. Out of the 465 English Members there is a majority of seventy-one against Home Rule, and there is a small majority if Scotland and Wales are added. It has been urged that we should not consider from what parts of the United Kingdom the majority comes. When we are acting as a United Assembly I admit the cogency and force of that argument, but it seems to me a different thing when the question before the House is not that of legislation for the United Kingdom, but breaking up the United Kingdom and putting the Constitution itself into the melting pot. Even if it could be shown that Home Rule would be a benefit to Ireland, which I strongly disbelieve, it can be proved, at the same time, that it would be injurious and dangerous to the United Kingdom, and no cause could be of greater consequence than the security and welfare of the country at large. There are also good reasons to be derived from the strongly-marked religious and social divisions in Ireland against the proposal to grant Home Rule. The agrarian war is now happily suspended, and all reason for it has been removed by generous legislation. But it is quite possible to conceive that the war may be renewed, and that the conspiracy to drive out the landlords, who have been stigmatised as the English garrison, may be revived under a new but equally immoral aspect, and that it may have the sanction of a Parliament in Dublin. For my own part, I have always held that, so long as Ireland remains a part of the United Kingdom, it has a fair claim upon the resources of the United

*Mr. W. Kenrick*

Kingdom to settle the agrarian question. But now we know that among the powers claimed by the Nationalists is, that of dealing with the land. That is included in the irreducible minimum with which they will be satisfied. Besides the Land Question difficulty, we have to consider the religious, class, and race hatred in Ireland. I believe it would pass the wit of man to devise any scheme of Home Rule by what effective guarantees could be provided for the protection of the minority. Does the present political action of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and priesthood of Ireland give reason to expect toleration or moderation in the exercise of power if it should be granted to them? The hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) has given most remarkable instances of the unjustifiable influence of the priesthood in recent Elections. That unjustifiable influence has existed for many years, but since the break up of the Nationalist Party there has been evidence from within the ranks of its exercise. The *Dublin Daily Independent* has stated that the service of priests as election agents were sought because of the undue influence they might have; and *United Ireland* has declared that the illiterate voters are obliged to declare, in the presence of the priests, the names of the candidates for whom they voted; that the voters were brought up in batches by clergymen, received inside by clergymen, and that they voted in their presence. The interference of clergymen in England is generally considered undesirable, and has been reprobated; but what occurs in England in that respect is but the faintest shadow of what goes on in Ireland. Even the correspondent of the *Star* was struck, during the candidature of Sir John Pope Hennessy, with the extent to which the parish priests in Ireland had to do with the Election, and he wrote stating that it was impossible for people living in England to imagine it. I am not, therefore, surprised that the Protestants of Ulster, and that very many Roman Catholics, are not content to trust their political liberties to agencies such as these, or that the Belfast Convention should protest against being handed over to their

enemies by a Parliament in Dublin, elected by such men. It was only natural that they should make a solemn appeal, which went to the hearts of Englishmen, that they should not be deprived of the protection of the English Parliament and laws, in which they claim to have an inheritance. I believe with the late Mr. John Bright that there is no grievance from which Ireland has ever suffered that cannot be remedied by an Imperial Parliament, and I believe, at the same time, that the minority can only be protected and justice done while England and Ireland remain under one Parliament. There was about the speech of the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy) a vagueness and a tenderness which suggested that the questions addressed to the Government were less spontaneous than a matter of arrangement. But in the speech of the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond) tenderness was replaced by severe, nay cruel precision, which I should imagine was anything but pleasant and satisfactory to Gentlemen on this side of the House. The hon. Member for Waterford demands that Ireland shall continue to block the way, and it is clear that right hon. Gentlemen have got a severe and exacting taskmaster. We must remember that, though the hon. Member for Waterford represents but a small section of the Nationalist Party, he represents the extreme section, which in Ireland has generally won the day; and, moreover, it must be remembered that the demands he has made are the demands of the whole Party. With respect to the retention of the Irish Members, the right hon. Member for Midlothian has been to-night in his explanation as vague as he always has been. He declared that it was a matter for after consideration, forgetting that he had previously said that the problem of retaining the Irish Members at Westminster when Home Rule was granted passed the wit of man. But the hon. Member for Waterford declared that any attempt which might be made to grant Home Rule to Ireland, and yet retain the Irish Members at Westminster, will be a conspicuous failure. The financial arrange-

ments of Ireland will always prove a burning question if you are to have Home Rule. Unless you have a full and adequate representation of the Irish Members at Westminster any demand which is made on the Irish people will soon come to be regarded as a tribute paid to an alien people. The hon. Member for Waterford did not intend the Gladstonian Party to continue to live in a fool's paradise, and he made it plain to them that when they cross the floor of this House they will have reached a fool's purgatory. I was never more satisfied than now to belong to the Unionist Party, which has a clear, avowed, and safe policy. The fears as to the Irish demands have been abundantly justified by this Debate. It cannot be long before a fresh appeal is made to the country, and I am pleased to think that the issue will be a clear one. The question will be whether the Home Rule Bill is to satisfy the demands of the Irish Nationalists or the prudent resolve of the English people, and I venture to think that the Bill will meet with the same fate as its predecessor.

\* (9.20.) MR. C. J. DARLING (Deptford): I am satisfied that the Government has taken a proper course in inviting this Debate, but, at the same time, I feel a certain amount of difficulty in voting against an Amendment proposed in the terms in which this is proposed and argued upon as it has been in this House. If one considers the two propositions; that it is well that the country should have confidence in Her Majesty's Ministers, and that this House has not confidence in the present Government, we must admit that it is well that there should be that confidence, and that to assert that the present Government possesses that confidence is to assert that which is not strictly, in all respects, accurate. But I have something further to do. I have not only to say for myself that this House has no confidence in the Government, but I have to represent a number of other people, and these people have confidence in Her Majesty's Ministers. A large number of persons,

*Mr. W. Kenrick*

with excellent means of judging, who have not been misled by beer or cheap loaves, nor by any appeal except the highest possible appeal to the highest possible intelligence, having been called upon to decide between me, who have often been reminded in this House of my manifold imperfections, and a late colleague of the right hon. Gentleman, an Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, came to the conclusion, unassisted by beer and not led away by loaves, and only moderately influenced by posters of any possible colour, that they have confidence in Her Majesty's present Advisers. Therefore, I am obliged, on their behalf, to vote that this House has confidence in them. What reasons have been given why the country should not have confidence in them? The country is not like a cynical Member of this House; it has confidence in somebody. If it has not confidence in Her Majesty's Government, in whom has it confidence? That is my difficulty. I do not know where the country has reposed its confidence. Who has confidence in those who, on Friday next, will replace Her Majesty's Government? I suppose the Russians have, I suppose the French have, and I suppose the Dutch are beginning to have some. They have confidence that we shall again see that foreign policy which we remember so well six years ago. We shall see, I have not the slightest doubt, the Russians expressing confidence in the next Government, and the highest gratification that they have taken the place of Her Majesty's present Ministers. We shall see the French, who want to occupy Egypt, expressing the highest confidence and regard for Her Majesty's Government; and we shall probably see them addressing to Ministers a proposal that they shall carry out the professions of Opposition and evacuate Egypt in favour of the French. But there is a hope that Lord Rosebery will be the Foreign Minister, and he is in sufficient accord with the foreign policy of Lord Salisbury for the country to hope he will carry it out against the policy of the right hon. Member for Newcastle and the right hon. Member for Midlothian. But the Russians and the French are not, after all, so easily

swayed as the sympathetic majority of this House, and they will not give their confidence until they know that the majority is going to remain some time in power. Therefore, I say, it is much better that this Debate should take place in the face of Europe, and that every foreign Ambassador and *attaché* should listen to it and send a note of it to his Government. What they will tell their Governments is that the Government which is going out is strong in the support of a united majority, and that the new Government is backed up by men whose support may be withdrawn on Monday next, and may be withdrawn on some matter which no Foreign Power can appreciate. It is well, therefore, that we should have had this Debate, that it may be seen that if this Government has not an absolute majority in this House, it has a far more solid amount of support than can be looked for by the Government which is coming in. There are other reasons why one would like to say a word in the course of this Debate. The hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) seems to think there is no justification for this Debate—that it is enough to take some paper like the *Graphic*, and, by means of a ladder or some such pictorial representation, see how many there are on one side and how many on the other. The hon. and learned Member said there was nothing to discuss. I regret to say his speech was more redolent of the forum than was appropriate in a speech addressed to this House. The indictment had been drawn, the jury had been empannelled, the Judge had taken his seat, the verdict had been arrived at, and the sentence was to immediately follow. How did he come to that conclusion? Merely by saying that there were forty or more on one side of the House than on the other. Is it, then, true to say, "*La raison du plus fort est toujours la meilleure*"? Why, only a few months ago, if we said there was a majority of sixty or so on this side of the House, we were told, particularly by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), that that was no sort of argument at all, and that the persons who had the most reason on their side generally had

the smallest number. And he told us that to make use of a majority was to do that which in almost any circumstances was wholly unjustified, and that the mere fact that you had a majority proved neither this nor that. Now all is changed. I have nothing to recant. I have always had the greatest respect for minorities, and the smaller they are the more I respect them. It must be so—the side of the *élite* can never be the largest in numbers. But I know the country is not governed on these principles. I almost wonder, however, that the country is governed on the principles it is, but I have always accepted them, because I was told that they were established by our forefathers at the cost of their precious blood, and that, therefore, we should value them. For my own part, I have not always admired, and do not admire now, the Constitution of this country above that of all other countries in the world. But one has to submit—and I am sure I do most cheerfully—that the majority should govern this country for a time. But one also has to admit that the majority never governs it for very long—that the people of this country come to the conclusion in a year or two, or three, or six at the outside, that for the majority to govern is a perfectly indefensible manner of government, and that the minority should be made into a majority in their turn. At the present time hon. Members opposite have a majority, or something like one. The hon. and learned Member for East Fife says it is enough to say that his Party has a majority of about forty, and that no more debate is necessary. I venture to think that the Debate which has taken place shows conclusively how thoroughly unjustified that statement was. This has been an interesting and instructive Debate, not from anything I have said, but from what I have listened to. It has been a most interesting Debate, if only to sit and listen to the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond) asking questions of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, and to observe the right hon. Gentleman making a long speech and not answering one of them, and going away before anyone could ask



him another. Now, what are we reproached with? We are reproached with having in the past done a variety of things we should not have done. The hon. and learned Member for East Fife says we have abandoned our Tory principles. That is entirely new to me as a reproach coming from a Radical, because I have always understood that we had no principles to abandon. I have always understood that whatever principles we had died when the House of Hanover came in, and since then we have lived upon other people's. What principles have we abandoned? I do not know. But whatever principles we have abandoned we can say that we have not adopted any others. We have not abandoned the principle of passing legislation for the improvement of the social well-being of the people in order to tinker with the Constitution. It is the other side that are continually and suddenly abandoning their principles, and, as to those of them who do not, the hon. Member for East Fife calls them "political apostates." Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been informed by the hon. Member for the Scotland Division (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) that the elections in various constituencies have been won on various issues. It can hardly be in the memory of anyone that a certain issue was presented to the country with the result that every constituency voted upon it. Fun has been made of an hon. Member—not one sitting on this side of the House—because he secured his seat by subscribing to the funds of a Home for Idiots. I did not do that. I am not in the habit of providing refuges for Members of the Radical Party, and I gave no subscription, therefore, to an institution of that character. There no doubt have been elections won by this kind of promise and that kind, by a generous subscription here and there. We must not reproach these people. We admit that scarcely a single constituency is won by argument—mine is an exceptional constituency—by pure dry argument about matters of interest to politicians. This Election was won by various means, and I do not know that it was won by worse means than any other. At all events, if it were won by unworthy means, we did not win

Mr. C. J. Darling

it, and therefore we have reason to be satisfied. But I was rather struck not with the instances given by the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool as to the seductive influence of beer, because I do not appreciate the charms which that liquid has—but I was rather struck with the instances given by the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell), who showed that election after election was won in Ireland by the interference—the improper and the unworthy interference—of the Roman Catholic priests. I was somewhat struck by those instances, and I supposed after that allegation someone who knows them would have got up and defended them against that attack. But no, absolute silence has been maintained. There were the instances given of the Pastoral published by the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland, of cases of interference in the elections at the polling booths, and of the priests getting themselves adopted as personation agents, all the cases of interference being given as following after the publication of the Pastoral; and after hearing this I was not surprised that the hon. and learned Member for East Fife should have said *Roma locuta est*. When I read the result of the county elections I said, *Bos locutus est*. But the hon. and learned Member has let the House into the secret. *Roma locuta est*—the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland have spoken, the priests have acted, and the case was finished. Now hon. Members understand out of the mouths of the junior Members of the Radical Party, precisely to whom to attribute the victory that Party has won. I hope the Presbyterian constituents of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife will like the result, which is that every question that does not interest *Roma* is to be put on one side. I do not fancy the people of this country, and particularly the people of London, are going to be content with the reception which has been given to matters which interest them since this Parliament met a few days ago. Having just gone through an election, I do not want to give my personal experiences of what the people of London expect—I say I do not want to give my personal experiences,

because the experiences of no man interest anybody else, although few people realise that. Hon. Gentlemen opposite must know perfectly well that the matters about which they talked on the platform, and which got them support and a cheer and a vote, were not high-flown speeches and Constitutional discussions concerning Home Rule. They were questions as to what the Government would do after it got into power for the people of England, what legislation the Government would pass to make them happier and richer, to give them more employment and more amusement as well. Does anyone suppose that there is amongst the people of England the wild enthusiasm which characterises this House as to whether the Irish Members are to stop here or not? I do not believe a Parliamentary candidate would get an extra vote by declaring to his constituents that he was prepared to allow the Irish Members to sit at Westminster as well as having a Parliament of their own in Dublin. Constituents of Gentlemen opposite will ask them when they go back, Have you even discussed the Eight Hours Bill, or One Man One Vote? Have you discussed the question of taking away from Ireland the over-representation it has got? Have you tried to satisfy the Welsh? They will only be able to answer that they have resolved to give Ireland a Parliament, and to have the Irish Members here as well. How, the people will ask, did the Parliament in its first meetings show its sympathy with the demands of the English people? Did not the Labour Members instantly make a great figure in the Debate? Why are the tribunes of Hyde Park dumb? How is it that the men who have been leading the people almost to riot have not said a word? The people will merely be told that it was not convenient to the Irish Party that a word should be said. We heard to-day that pathetic remark of the right hon. Member for Midlothian that he intended to devote the remainder of his public life to Ireland. I do not mean to imply any reproach, or that there is anything ignoble in it. Ireland is fortunate beyond its deserts, but I think the result will be the disappoint-

ment of the democracy of England, or of Britain, if you like that better. What have they done that all his interest in them should cease? There are other questions quite as important as Ireland, and he has deserted the English people. His sole link with public life is Ireland, and when that work is accomplished there is no more interest for him in public affairs. There is no power left in the Liberal Party to do anything except pass Home Rule, and there is no feeling of enthusiasm on the part of the English people for Home Rule, except that it might be quickly got out of the way and English questions might be considered. It is well that we should have had this Debate, if only for that sentence, that the people may know that the result of this Election has been to bring back into power the Irish Party, which has prevented legislation for England during the whole time that the right hon. Member for Midlothian was last in Office. The hon. Member for Waterford enjoyed reading to the House that fable about Sinbad and the Old Man of the Sea. I wonder he does not pursue his researches a little further into the *Arabian Nights*, and study another legend about the doings of an ancient woodcutter and forty other persons. I congratulate the Irish Members on the share they have had in this Debate, for whatever service they have done to their own country it is certain they have done no little service to ours.

(10.3.) MR. TIMOTHY HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour): I do not know that the House has ever listened to a speech of the same length with less meaning, less point, and less wit, laboured though it was, than that of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. We have in this Debate a purpose more grave than that to which he has directed the attention of the House. He has endeavoured to call attention to some of the questions put by my hon. Friend the Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond); but those questions were not put with the intention of assisting the Party to which the

hon. Gentleman belongs. From us they deserve no sympathy; they are entitled to no gratitude; and any questions we have found it necessary to put we have put in the discharge of our duty to our constituents. When a chance of uniting the two peoples is presented to this House, the mischievous speeches of some Members, and some political intriguers outside, deprive Parliament of the opportunity. In the speech of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), so far as he is personally concerned, we have the assurance that there is no breaking away from the promises that have been made and the hopes which have been held out to the Irish people, and that he will endeavour, as far as lies in his power, to settle the Irish Question. I wish to address myself rather to his followers who wish to remove the idea, settled for years in the minds of the English people, that English legislation is not to be proceeded with till the Irish Question is cleared out of the way. Any doubts that have been raised in Ireland as to the future policy of the Liberal Party are the result of speeches made in England and of writings in England, and not of anything said by any Member of the extreme section of the Irish Party. There are one or two points in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman which I am bound to say will cause a feeling of uneasiness and dissatisfaction in Ireland. Our duty on this subject is to be frank. We have no desire to aid Gentlemen on the other side of the House, but our position, while of any service to Ireland, has been one of complete independence on both sides. While we desire to throw out men who have shown themselves incapable of appreciating the feelings and difficulties of Ireland, it is our duty at the same time to warn those who may assume Office—though we have no desire to embarrass them—that there are questions in Ireland to which they will have immediately to direct their attention, unless they wish to give their opponents an opportunity of creating embarrassments and difficulties. I was sorry the right hon. Gentleman dismissed the question of the evicted tenants with so few words. That question is to us of the very first import-

*Mr. Timothy Harrington*

ance, and it is one which it will be impossible for the Liberal Party to neglect. The present position of these tenants and the hopes held out to them compel the Liberal Party to take the earliest opportunity of endeavouring to come to their relief. On that question all sections of the Irish representation on this side are united, and this difficulty is the first which will present itself to the Liberal Party in the government of Ireland; and to postpone the question, when an Autumn Session might be held, and an easy settlement arrived at, will give the landlords a chance of gathering strength to make the position more embarrassing, and to increase the number of "planters," and is the most foolish policy the Party can adopt. These tenants, by their sacrifices and struggles in 1886-7, won the Land Act of 1887 from a Government which had no sympathy with Irish sufferings. Their position is precisely the same as that of those who were relieved by the Act of 1881, and we ask on their behalf, not that you should amend the Act of 1881 or go beyond the Act of 1887, but that the men who fought for the Act of 1887 should be allowed to participate in its benefits. I see no difficulty in the way of the Liberal Party taking up the question immediately. The question of the number of "planters" is a bogey raised by the Conservative Party, and it is a perfectly absurd and ridiculous question. In only a very few instances "planters," who were offered exceptional terms, from whom no rent was taken, and some of whom were actually paid, were induced to take evicted farms, but they have no intention of taking up a permanent abode among people who would be hostile to them for generations. It is absurd to say that some wise provision to compensate these men for the time they have lost might not be combined with some scheme which would enable the old tenants to purchase their holdings. Such an Act would not occupy much time, and if the Liberal Leaders are wise in their generation, and know how this question is burnt into the Irish heart, they will take the opportunity of immediately turning their attention to it. There was another

point which will cause a sense of disappointment. It is hard on occasions of this kind to press one in the position of the right hon. Gentleman for full and frank statements as if in Office; and though we cannot forget how much we owe to his wonderful energy and unselfishness, we also remember the doctrine he has taught, that if we are to accomplish anything for our country it is by perfect independence of him and every other Party in this House. The statement he has made in respect to the review of the sentences of political prisoners is not calculated to give satisfaction, but is likely to create a feeling of discomfort and trouble in the future. I am always amazed at the manner in which English Members treat this question of amnesty. If you look back at the history of Ireland you will find that every agitation has had its root in the desire for amnesty. You allowed that desire to gather force until by its pressure on the House it was bound to be recognised and action taken upon it, but before that time it had laid the foundations of a new agitation and a new difficulty. That is the position in which you stand with regard to the question to-day. We have no sympathy with the objects of these men, and no excuse for those who were guilty; but if you say that every two or three years long sentences shall be reviewed, you are holding out hopes and giving an opportunity to men who wish to create a fresh difficulty in the government of Ireland. I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman and those who are likely to co-operate with him not to be regulated by the conduct of past Governments in this matter, but to take a broad and generous view of the question, and, as they are endeavouring to allay national feeling in Ireland and to repair the disasters of the past, to seize this golden opportunity of blotting out every shred of groundwork for agitation in future in connection with political prisoners. If the Liberal Party are wise, they will take the opportunity of dealing with these two questions, if not by legislation in the autumn, by promises so definite and clear that they will leave no uncertainty in the mind of

Ireland as to what the policy of the Government will be. There is nothing difficult or impossible to a Liberal Government in making a just settlement of the case of the evicted tenants.

(10.20.) COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): I should not have ventured to intervene in this Debate but for the fact that the Irish Question is apparently the pivot on which Imperial policy turns; and, speaking as I do in the name of perhaps the most powerful section of the Irish people, I feel it my duty, on their behalf, to say a word on an occasion which I believe will be always of historical interest. The hon. and learned Member who has just sat down appeared to imagine that some sympathy was felt on this side of the House for him and his friends. I assure him that is a mistake. The so-called Nationalist Party in Ireland is now divided, I believe, into two sections. We have no sympathy with either; we equally dislike them both, and if ever the opportunity should occur of overturning them both we should take it. The speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian and of the hon. and learned Member for Fife appeared to me to be constructed on similar lines. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian and the hon. and learned Member for Fife both appeared to take exception to the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government in consenting to meet Parliament and to challenge a Vote of Confidence; but both these Gentlemen appear to forget or to overlook this fact, that almost up to the present moment they were absolutely in the dark as to whether they possessed a majority in this House or not. They knew the moment the elections were over that they did not possess a British majority; because it is a fact which cannot be denied that if the votes over Great Britain were taken the Unionist Party would still be in a majority; and therefore it altogether depended on the course that would be pursued by hon. Gentlemen from

Ireland below the Gangway. Now, the support of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway is an inconstant quantity. It is very hard to calculate from day to day or from month to month on which side they will vote—the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian desires to get their support, and when I listened to his speech I wondered very much what effect that would have on the Irish Nationalist Party. The first part of his speech does not, I think, require any comment. The only part of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman which can, I think, be of any interest to the House was that part of it which dealt with the Irish Question, and what he proposed to do with the Irish Question when his hypothetical Government came into power. What did he say? That part of his speech, I think, was quite touching. He said that the Irish Question was the last link that bound him to public life. He said he intended to devote the remainder of his life to carrying to a satisfactory conclusion the great Irish problem. He intends to bring in, he said, a Home Rule Bill. What that Home Rule Bill is to be we do not know. He gave no inkling to the House of any kind or description of its main principles. But he proposes to bring in a Home Rule Bill, and he says he will carry it through the House of Commons. I suppose he possibly may; perhaps he may not. I look upon it as extremely problematical; but even if he did carry it through the House of Commons, he says he then proposes to send the Bill to the House of Lords. And then the accents of the right hon. Gentleman became tragic in the extreme. He did not intend, he told the House, to act as Lord Melbourne did. But he intended to send the Bill up to the House of Lords; he made certain threatening allusions, I think, to what might take place in that august Assembly, should they reject that measure. He did not tell us exactly what he would do; but he said what shall be the course that the Liberal Party shall pursue in case the House of Lords rejects the Home Rule Bill? We listened with bated breath to hear what course the right hon. Gentleman and his Party would pursue.

*Colonel Sanderson*

There may have been Members of that august Assembly listening within these walls to what it was that he intended to do. "We do not intend to resign." If any Member of that august Assembly happened to be within these walls, I am sure they felt much relieved that they did not intend to resign; but he hesitated to go on with those legislative projects which he developed at Newcastle. What then was to happen to the Home Rule Bill he did not inform the House. I wondered what the hon. Member for Waterford thought of it all. As to the other Gentlemen from Ireland who do not belong to the Party of the hon. Gentleman, I do not think it much matters what they think; they are not their own masters. There was a time when a tragic figure used to rise on those Benches opposite and direct the movements of the Home Rule Party. Mr. Parnell at that time was master of the Nationalist situation. But the figure that directs and guides seventy at least, or seventy-one, I think, of hon. Members from Ireland does not sit in this House. He is an Irish priest who lives in Dublin, and it is not a question of what hon. Members below the Gangway think, or what they intend to do with regard to an Irish measure. The question is what Archbishop Walsh intends to do. So that we have now the Nationalist Party divided under two heads—we have the Redmondite-Parnellites and the Walshites. This, I think, differentiates the present condition of affairs from all preceding circumstances that have occurred in our Parliamentary history. We had O'Connell and his brass band, who had the power of turning out the Government in his day; but he was a Member of the House of Commons and could be dealt with here. Then we had Mr. Parnell, who had absolute authority over almost the lives of hon. Gentlemen opposite. He could starve them out if he liked. If so, the House of Commons could deal with him. But now we have seventy Members of the House of Commons returned absolutely by an Irish priest and his acolytes in Ireland—"No!"—absolutely dependent upon him for their election. ("No, no!") It is all very well for hon. Members to say

"No." They would not say "No" in Ireland. We cannot deal in the House of Commons with the reverend gentleman; and the question we have now got to ask is, not what the Leader of the House of Commons intends to do with his majority; the whole question depends upon what Archbishop Walsh intends to do. I defy contradiction. ("No, no!") I do not care for "No, no!" I require proof. What is the opinion of Roman Catholics on the subject. This is the opinion of a Roman Catholic newspaper, edited by a Roman Catholic, which I think worthy of being read to the House. It simply recites what occurred at an Irish election, and this is what this Roman Catholic paper says on the subject—

"When priests leave their congregations without Mass on Sunday and lead them instead to a political meeting; when a priest rides at the head of his congregation armed with a hunting crop, and finding himself in a position of strength attacks his neighbours who differ from him in politics: when punishment in this life and in the next is openly proclaimed as the consequence of voting for the Parnellite candidate, it is no wonder that an ignorant constituency can carry everything their own way. This is what happened in East Mayo, and in many other constituencies. We know very well by what means the melancholy humbug has been returned."

The "melancholy humbug" may be the hon. Member for East Mayo.

MR. M. BODKIN (Roscommon, N.): Name the paper.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: The *Independent*. (Laughter.) I understood that was a Roman Catholic paper. When I listened to the speech of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife, it struck me that the hon. and learned Member had overlooked the peculiar nature of the majority by which he hoped to obtain a seat on the Treasury Bench. The hon. and learned Member did not appear to me to take a just view of the value of the great questions of the day. He seemed to have in his mind but one question, which obscured and dwarfed all the rest. Unionist Members, whether Irish, English, Scotch, or Welsh, look

upon Home Rule as the most important question of the day; but in the mind of the hon. and learned Member the question of supreme importance is that right hon. Gentlemen on the Government Bench should get out, and that he should get in. The hon. and learned Member asked what right had anyone to say that the majority by which he and his friends hoped to get into power was more an Irish than a Scotch or a Welsh majority. It is very easy to show that it is an Irish majority. It has already been shown by some of his own friends. The forty men whose votes will decide on Thursday who are to sit on the Treasury Bench are Irishmen, and it is because of that fact that we have a right to say that the majority is an Irish majority. The hon. and learned Member made a mistake if he thought he was dependent on those old-fashioned Liberal majorities which existed in former times. He is sitting on the very lips of an Irish volcano. Indications have been given that an explosion may not be very far distant, and that explosion will perform the same fate for the hon. and learned Member that it is to perform for the Unionist Government on Thursday. Is it to be believed that the British people, when they realise that the Government of this country is to be carried on, not by a Party dependent on free British support, but by a Government whose foundation is based solely on the will of an Irish priest and his followers, will be satisfied to allow such a state of things to continue? It cannot be believed, especially as the objects which the English and the Scotch and the Welsh people most desire are to be put aside, and the whole energy of the Party is to be devoted to carrying a Home Rule Bill, the rejection of which by the House of Lords is not to cause the resignation of the Government. Such a policy is not one which will satisfy a freedom-loving people. On behalf of those whom I represent, I say that events have absolutely justified the stand we have made against Home Rule. We have all along said that the prevailing power in Ireland is the power of the Church of Rome. It is impossible to

conceive, in the nineteenth century, in this civilised country, the hold the Church of Rome has over the Irish people. Bishop Nulty, a distinguished Prelate of that Church, in a charge he delivered, divided the Home Rule Party into two sections. There are the seventy sheep who accepted the voice of the shepherd, who take not only their religion but their politics as well from the priests of their Church; and there are the Pagans, the followers of the hon. Member for Waterford. The question is whether the Pagans or the sheep of the Church of Rome are to prevail. Those whom I represent absolutely refuse to accept the rule of either one or the other. I must say that it is hard to conceive how any Radical Member of this House can consent, even for a moment, to follow either one or the other of those bodies. Who could have conceived the possibility of the right hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) going to Canossa and consenting to sit on the Treasury Bench, at the will, and by the authority, of a priest of the Church of Rome? And yet that will be the right hon. Gentleman's position on Thursday. It was impossible, before this Debate took place, to conceive that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, with his historic past, would have consented to terminate a great and successful life amid a scene of unparalleled political degradation. No degradation, to the mind of an Englishman or a Briton, could be more odious or disgraceful than that which will be entailed by sitting on the Treasury Bench by the will and by the authority of an Irish Roman Catholic priest. The fact is that Archbishop Walsh will be the chief Member of the Cabinet. I do not know to what extent he will deem it right to intervene in foreign affairs; but, so far as the Irish Question is concerned, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian will be absolutely tied to the cassock of this Irish Prelate. I do not admire the political principles of the right hon. Gentleman; but to me it is a sad thing to see, at the end of his great and successful life, an old, and, in many ways, a noble Englishman, dragged at

*Colonel Saunderson*

the chariot wheels of the most bigoted priesthood that has ever existed in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman may carry the Home Rule Bill by the aid of a majority of this House; but there is another obstacle that will have to be encountered besides the House of Lords, and that is the loyal people of Ireland, who are determined to reject it. The right hon. Gentleman has said that all this talk about the resistance to the measure by the loyalists of Ulster is mere idle wind, but hon. Members from Ireland know what that resistance means. But no one who has observed the course of recent events can deny the enormous effect which has been produced, especially in Scotland, by what has recently taken place in Ireland. (Laughter.) You may laugh at me. No words in the English language can express my utter indifference to whether you do so or not. But no man who came over to Belfast would laugh at the twelve thousand Ulster loyalists who represented the backbone and the sinew of that country; and I say that, whether the House of Lords rejects this Bill or does not, we reject it, and that although you may occupy the House of Commons in years to come with academic Debates upon the value of this Home Rule Bill, when all is said, and even if you pass this Bill, I say, in the name of my people, we will reject it.

An hon. MEMBER: Who are you?

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: No man has a better right to say that than I. I say, in their name, that we will reject it; and that if you ever try to erect it in Ireland we will crumble it into dust.

(10.53.) MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): The last Parliament had become so accustomed to the speeches of the hon. and gallant Member who has just sat down that it was never considered necessary to seriously notice them. The boast of the hon. Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), that he and his friends would resist the Home Rule Bill if

passed by Parliament and sanctioned by the Queen, is a boast so absurd, to anybody who has had acquaintance, as I have had for many years, with the Province of Ulster, that it is hardly worth noticing at all. The hon. and gallant Member spoke, with considerable effect to his Orange friends around him, of the interference of certain priests in Irish affairs. He said that the Irish Home Rule Party was controlled by Archbishop Walsh. Well, I can assure hon. Members upon both sides of this House—and the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, I think, will admit in common fairness the truth of what I say—that there are at least a number of Members in this House representing Irish constituencies—Nationalists to the heart's core, who fought the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian when he opposed the National demand, who suffered in prison under him and under the present Government, who fought for years the present Government and every Government, and who are as attached to the Nationalist cause in Ireland as any man in this House can claim to be—who, I say without fear of contradiction, are quite as determined that an Irish Parliament, when assembled in Dublin, shall be as free from undue interference by the Church of Rome as we are resolved that it shall be free from the undue interference of this House and of this country. The hon. Member for North Armagh and his friends have for many years past used with very great effect against Home Rule the arguments which he has used once more to-night. He has endeavoured to frighten the people of this country into the belief that, when an Irish Parliament is established in Ireland by this House, it would be controlled by the Catholic clergy of Ireland, and that the Catholic Church would probably be placed in an ascendant position to the disadvantage of the Protestants, Presbyterians, and the various other sects in Ireland. That argument has had the greatest possible effect in many parts of this country. I myself know hon. Members, some of whom are sitting on these Benches, representing English constituencies, who have discussed this

argument with me on occasions when I have visited parts of England to address English meetings; and I know, from having spoken in England and in Scotland, that one of the most powerful motives operating in the minds of some of the men wavering on the Home Rule Question is the very motive put by the hon. Member and his friends—that an Irish Parliament would be controlled by the Catholic clergy. It is true that the Members of the Party with which I am associated in this House are not very many in numbers; but I may re-assure English and Scotch Members that though we are few in numbers we represent, according to the last Election, 70,000 determined Nationalists in every portion of Ireland, each of whom declared by his vote his dissatisfaction with the present government of Ireland, and his determination not to be satisfied till a National Parliament of the Irish people was set up; but every one of these 70,000 men also voted to show you English and Scotch Members that even Irish Catholic Nationalists can be as independent of influence unduly exercised by Catholic priests as Scotchmen and Englishmen themselves would be. Therefore I say, in view of this fact, and of the agitation of the last two years in Ireland against the undue interference of priests wherever it was exercised, that the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh cannot with effect use his argument about priestly domination and dictation; and, so far from getting an argument from recent events in Ireland calculated to uphold the declaration of the hon. and gallant Member, there is not a thinking Scotchman or Englishman in this House or in the country who will not believe that an Irish Parliament will be as free and independent as any other Parliament, and that the Irish people will as independently exercise their opinions. The collapse of the Tory Party at the present time must be great indeed when they are driven to such a last resource as to put up the hon. and gallant Member to try to keep themselves in power by frightening hon. Members on these Benches with the bogey that if Home Rule be passed Ulster will go into



civil war. I had the advantage for seven years of being an Ulster Member. I know the people pretty well. They are, in my opinion, the most likely people on the face of the earth to repel any invasion of, and to fight to the bitter end, for their rights and privileges, religious or civil. They would throw aside their ploughs and spades and fight to the end; but I am equally certain that there is no people on the face of the earth who would be so slow to enter into a rebellious movement, who would be so slow to give up their ordinary duties for agitation or civil war, as the Ulster people, so long as they are left alone and their rights are not invaded. And when the Irish Parliament is established, and when those hard-headed and quick-witted Northern men—industrious, sober people as they are—find that their Catholic fellow-countrymen in Ireland are independent men, and that they are not inclined to interfere with the religious or civil liberty of any people or section in Ireland, and when they find that through the Dublin Parliament justice, equality, and fair-play are meted out to the North as well as to the South, I predict that in a very short time indeed the people of Ulster will be the strongest supporters and the staunchest upholders of the Irish Government and the Irish Parliament. Those who are so suspicious now will be re-assured, and they will not for a moment think of leaving the Parliament of their native country and of giving up their industrial lives in order to follow the standard of the hon. Member for North Armagh and to draw the sword upon their fellow-countrymen, who are as much interested in the welfare of Ireland as they are. I do beseech Members on this side for Scotland and England, and especially those who were not in the last Parliament, when they enter upon the consideration of the Home Rule Question, not for one single moment to allow themselves to be alarmed or betrayed from giving a hearty support to Home Rule by any speeches such as that of the hon. and gallant Member; and when they are told about priestly dictation, and it is said that an Irish Parliament

*Mr. William Redmond*

would be controlled by Archbishop Walsh, I beg them to remember that the heart of Ireland, the capital of Ireland, the place which will be the seat of the new Government, the great city of Dublin, is at the present moment represented by men who were, unfortunately, we regret it, opposed by Archbishop Walsh and by the priests of the district, but who, nevertheless, although Catholics themselves, considered it their duty, as independent men in politics, to take their own course, though they might be so opposed. I am a Catholic myself. I appreciate with sadness the tone adopted by the hon. and gallant Member. I know there is a section of the people in the North of Ireland who, unfortunately, for Party purposes, are not above attempting to re-light that hateful feeling of bigotry which existed between Catholics and Protestants. That is a hateful and loathsome attempt, in the opinion not only of the Catholics of Ireland, but of nine-tenths of the co-religionists of hon. Members opposite. The best answer that can be given to the argument of the hon. and gallant Member is the conduct of Irishmen like my few colleagues and myself, who are devoted to our religion, who hate Orange ascendancy, but who are determined that the Protestants in the North of Ireland as well as the Protestants in England and Scotland shall see that while we are Roman Catholics in our religion we are not bound to, and will not, take in any degree our political teaching as well as our religious teaching from the Church of Rome. I would not have referred to the hon. and gallant Member at this length but for the fact that there are a number of new Members in the House. He usually comes into a Debate in the way that a farce is included in a theatre bill when the leading item is a tragedy or a serious play, and it may be well to point out to new Members that though he is warlike to the last degree in appearance; that though he declaims with his hand up-raised in the manner of a general ordering his victorious troops to charge; in spite of these terrible appearances he is really perfectly harmless. I am not sorry that the Government have given the opportunity of

introducing this Debate, and I should like to say, as did the hon. Member for Dublin Harbour (Mr. Harrington), that I have no desire to speak in terms of bitterness of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. I recognise, as most Irishmen do, that he has done much for our country, and I think very few people heard his declaration to-night without being affected by it. I have never had any feeling with regard to the right hon. Gentleman but a desire to help him, and the only regret in connection with his whole career is that he did not allow us without interference to select our own Leader, without regard to the high standard of English morality. I admit that his tone on the subject of Home Rule was encouraging to some extent; but there will be a considerable amount of dissatisfaction in certain portions of Ireland that the right hon. Gentleman did not see his way to be more explicit. There are several subjects which might have been dealt with—the subject of the Coercion Act, the political prisoners, and the evicted tenants. I have not gathered that there is any intention to repeal the Coercion Act. At present it is suspended, but the people of Ireland wish to have that Act wiped off the Statute Book. The right hon. Gentleman will have a majority of forty, principally composed of Irish Members, and he could, without much trouble, sweep away the infamous Act which has caused so much misery. Then, with regard to the political prisoners, I was not satisfied with the declaration on that subject. Is their cause to be considered or not? If it is not thought advisable to declare that they will be released, it should be made known that there will be an immediate inquiry. It is not right, and Ireland will not be satisfied if there is no declaration on this subject, and the House ought not to rise before some pronouncement has been made. To people who are suffering it is a long look out till next February. It may appear a short time to hon. Members who are going to holiday resorts and to their amusements, but it is a long while for the wives and families of these men, about whose conviction I should say there is grave doubt. There is nothing

unfair in our demand, and I think the right hon. Member for Midlothian ought to send the message of hope to Ireland that an inquiry shall take place. With respect to the evicted tenants, I say very much the same thing, and unless we have an explicit declaration as to what will be done there will be great disappointment and discontent in Ireland. The longer the question is delayed the more difficult it will be to deal with, and I beg the incoming Government to re-consider their decision not to have an Autumn Session. In the name of mercy let us meet in November to endeavour to do something for these evicted tenants. Further, the Irish people require the Home Rule Question to be dealt with honestly, fairly, and persistently by the Liberal Party; they will require an investigation into the case of the political prisoners; they will require an immediate dealing with the question of the evicted tenants; and they will require that that stigma and insult, the Coercion Act, shall be repealed on the first possible opportunity. I am going to give my vote to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian and his colleagues. But I must be allowed to say that I came into this House under the leadership and inspired by the teaching of the late Mr. Parnell. His teaching was that the Irish Members should be absolutely independent of all English Parties; that we should vote for whichever Party did most for us; and that we should vote against the Party which had done the least for us. I say I am going to vote against the present Government, because for six years they have tyrannised over the Irish people, persecuted them, imprisoned them, and they have attempted to degrade them and drive them from their native land. I am quite impartial, because I have had the honour of suffering imprisonment for considerable periods under both the Tory and Liberal Parties, but I shall vote for hon. Gentlemen I see below me now, because I have faith in them. I have faith in the right hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley). I have never heard him in this House say anything except that which was for the benefit of Ireland. He never was a Coercionist, and

he has always been a friend of Ireland, at least so the men I know best in Ireland regard him. Because of my strong belief in him, and because I believe you cannot put much worse men in Office than are now there—I do not say this in any insulting spirit—I am going to give my vote to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. I think it only fair and reasonable to give him the opportunity of doing what he has pledged himself to do. If the right hon. Gentleman is not able to deal with the various matters brought before him as we expect he will, we can only have recourse to the methods taught us by Mr. Parnell—of standing quite independent of each English Party; and so as we vote against the Tories to-day, if the Liberals do not come up to our expectations it will certainly be our duty to vote against them to-morrow.

(11.24.) Mr. J. ROSS (London-derry): The course of this Debate is being followed by the people of Ulster with intense anxiety, which will not be diminished, but intensified into alarm, when they come to-morrow morning to read the speech which has been delivered this afternoon by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. But before I say one word with regard to that remarkable utterance—remarkable not merely for what it contained, but remarkable also for what it did not contain—I have one word to say with regard to the people of Ulster on the main question. Whether Ulster's destiny may be as dark as many of us fear, or whether we may survive that destiny—whatever our fate, we wish it to be known that our gratitude to the present Government is imperishable, and that our confidence in them remains undiminished. We know the facts connected with Ireland of our own knowledge. It is not second-hand knowledge. We have not derived it from the election van or from the magic lantern. We have heard with our ears, and seen with our eyes, and we know that six years ago we lived in a country stormed by anarchic forces, where life and property were insecure, and conspiracy was in full force,

*Mr. William Redmond*

which had for its object the paralysis of the law; and we know that through the action of the present Government the forces of anarchy have been defeated; we know that conspiracy has been broken up, and that it is owing to the present Government we have been able to live for six years in a civilised country. Well, Sir, the time has come when the Government to which we owe so much is to be replaced by another. I listened with the greatest possible anxiety to the right hon. Gentleman this afternoon to learn what assurances he would give to the people of Ulster, and I heard not even an allusion to them from the beginning to the end. On the contrary, there was an omission from the right hon. Gentleman's speech of an extraordinary character. In the course of the Debate last evening the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond) made a startling and extraordinary demand on behalf of the people of Ireland. He demanded that the Imperial control of which we heard so much during the General Election was to be a sham. He demanded that the only veto should be subject to the advice of Irish Ministers, and if that is to be the statutory Constitution which is to be granted to the Irish people then the worst fears of Ulster are realised. Though hon. Members who sit under the Leadership of the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy) were appealed to again and again to say if they had any other expectations, they were silent. Not one of them said he expected or would accept anything less. When the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian rose in his place to-day we all watched with anxiety to hear how he would deal with that important matter, and the right hon. Gentleman never said one word on the question. The silence of the right hon. Gentleman under circumstances such as these constitute a subject of the gravest anxiety to us. We are told there are five thousand evicted tenants in Ireland, and that the Irish Party expect that the first act of the Liberal Government will be to re-instate those tenants in their holdings. Well, Sir, how is that dealt with by the right hon.

Gentleman the Member for Midlothian? He did not deal with it directly, but he uttered an ominous threat, and insinuated that it would be well for the landlords of the farms to make some terms with those evicted tenants in the autumn. Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that several of the "planters," especially on the Luggacurran estate, have bought their estates out, and that the landlords have nothing to do with them? How does he intend to deal with cases where men have settled on the land and bought it under an Act of Parliament? The next demand made on the right hon. Gentleman was that he would institute some inquiry into the case of certain prisoners; but I confess that I was quite unable to ascertain what the meaning of the right hon. Gentleman was. The third question of the hon. Member for North Longford was that the Crimes Act of 1887 should be suspended immediately a Liberal Government came in. The hon. Member seemed to forget that in consequence of the suspension of the disease the remedy had been suspended, but he seemed to contemplate that the disease is to begin again, notwithstanding that the remedy is to be suspended. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had uttered several predictions with respect to the administration of the Crimes Act. We were told that the gaols would be full of people; that freedom would disappear; that crime would be driven under the surface only to re-appear in frightful explosions. What has become of all those prophecies? They have been consigned to the limbo of the unfulfilled. There was another subject on which I should have liked to have heard the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. The Plan of Campaign is an article of faith with the Irish Members. How does the right hon. Gentleman intend to deal with it? If it were right a few winters ago it is right now. Will he deal with it as a criminal conspiracy, or will he back it up? The Chancellor of the Exchequer remarked that the right hon. Gentleman has an extraordinary knack of giving a mild name to a very strong thing. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Plan of Campaign was "a symptom," but he used no other word to connote it. But hon.

Members opposite have encouraged the Plan of Campaign by their words, and very often by their presence. If the Plan of Campaign make its appearance this winter how is the Irish Executive going to deal with it? We are told that they will deal with it according to the sympathies of the Irish people. In that case the Criminal Law will be absolutely unenforced. In the course of this Debate I have heard no criticism on any other subject than that of Ireland, and it is said that the present Government is to go out of Office simply because it has failed to satisfy the aspirations of the Irish people. I should like to know what Government ever will satisfy those aspirations? You might cast your name and fame and wealth into the bottomless pit of their aspirations; you will then be the poorer, but the Irish people will be no richer. But there is another Ireland which has aspirations also—aspirations to live in peace and on equality with their fellow-subjects, to enjoy the rights of free men, and not to be under the thralldom of an ecclesiastical despotism. That Irish nation is bound to you by the most sacred of all contracts. They have been planted by England on the soil, they have spent their resources in improving and cultivating it, and they have lived there in the faith that this great nation would never be false to its traditions and cast them off for the sake of making friends with those who were their foes. The right hon. Gentleman once blamed the people of the North of Ireland for not having spoken out when the conduct of the Representatives of the other parts of Ireland called for condemnation. The right hon. Gentleman cannot blame us now. We have indicated our views to you in no uncertain way. We have assembled our delegates in tens of thousands and our people in hundreds of thousands. We have held our own seats and we have assaulted and captured other seats in Ireland, and we have driven out of Ulster some of the leaders of the Party opposed to us. I do not know what may have been the means by which the elections in England were won, but I know the means by which the elections in Ireland were won, and I imagine the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P.

O'Connor) was unfortunate in alluding to the means by which the elections in this country were won, because he gave the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) an opportunity, of which he availed himself to the full, to show the gross means which were made use of in Ireland. In the North of Ireland candidates came professing to be of the same faith as the people, and availing themselves of the great name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, and they put the Home Rule Bill in the background; but notwithstanding all their arts their policy was rejected, and they themselves failed in making any impression upon the Ulster seats. If the verdict were won in the same way in England as it was won in Ireland, it was not a verdict on the merits, but a verdict won by fraud, and as such it should be set aside. The people of Ulster want to know in what way the right hon. Member for Midlothian proposes to deal with them. Are we simply to be told that our fears are absolutely groundless? I think we, the people of Ulster, ought to be able better than anybody else to form some estimate of the dangers to which we are exposed. But our case is made light of and laughed at, and the people of England are called upon to adopt a generous policy. I say, if England wants to be generous, let her be generous at her own expense, and not indulge her generosity at the expense of the lives and property of the people she is bound in honour to stand by. Instead of bringing peace to Ireland you are bringing a sword, you are inflicting a wrong that will be transmitted to our children, and instead of removing the Irish difficulty you are doing all that in you lies to make the Irish difficulty eternal. It is not a fortunate thing to drive a people faithful to you to despair. It was not a fortunate thing to maltreat and trample upon your North American Colonies, and I doubt whether it will be more fortunate for England if she treats the loyal people of Ulster as she now proposes to treat them. Are you determined to drive our people to flight or fight?—because these are the only alternatives put before us, and we are not inclined to fly. I do not believe

*Mr. J. Ross*

the English race will be so false to all their traditions that, for the sake of buying a so-called union of hearts, they will betray those who have been true to them throughout such a long period of time. Although the victory is yours for the present, yet I believe the time will come when we shall gain the day, and when the English race, once for all, will say that they will never allow the English name to be disgraced by such an act as is contemplated by right hon. Gentlemen opposite.

MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): I beg to move, Sir, that the Debate be now adjourned until Thursday.

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
"That the Debate be now adjourned."  
—(*Mr. Joseph Chamberlain.*)

(11.45.) MR. TIMOTHY HEALY (Louth, N.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest against the further adjournment of this Debate. We have been brought here at considerable inconvenience for the purpose of taking part in it, and we have listened to the same speeches repeated over and over again. There is a Standing Order against tedious repetition, and in spite of that we have the same remarks made again and again. It is nothing but a waste of time. Last night we heard the hon. Member for Bordesley (Mr. Jesse Collings) for nearly two hours. (MR. JESSE COLLINGS: Not so long as that.) And on Thursday we are to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. Well, Mr. Speaker, why is the House adjourned over to-morrow? Why should the Government waste our time by bringing us here on Thursday, when we might have listened to the right hon. Gentleman to-morrow? I think the time has now come to take a Division. Jobbery is going on apace in Ireland. The Government, having appointed Mr. Cecil Roche, R.M., a Fishery Commissioner, have made Mr. Olphert a Resident Magistrate. All the time is being availed of by the outgoing Government for the perpetration of jobbery. I am credibly informed

that no less than twenty Tory revising barristers have been appointed with warrants in their pockets by a secret document signed by the Lord Lieutenant. My hon. and learned Friend the Member for Derry (Mr. J. Ross) talks about Ulster, but he is Member for these Tory revising barristers. I am credibly informed that a revising barrister has been sent to gerrymander Derry by the outgoing Government. I protest against this further waste of time. I am informed that since Saturday no less than forty appointments have been made of sons-in-law, or prospective sons-in-law, of Members of the Government to positions in the Board of Works.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I do not wish to interrupt the argument of the hon. and learned Gentleman, but there is absolutely not the slightest foundation for the scandalous imputation he has made.

(Repeated cries of "Withdraw!")

MR. HEALY: One moment. My statement is founded on the authority of the Orange organ of Ireland, the *Dublin Daily Express*, the organ of Her Majesty's Government in Ireland.

MR. JACKSON: The words used by the hon. and learned Gentleman appeared in the *Freeman's Journal*.

MR. HEALY: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. I am quoting from the *Dublin Daily Express*, which described the proceeding as a "shameless job." But I have no objection, if the expression is thought to be disrespectful on the part of the Orange paper, or if it is unfounded, as I have no wish to become the means of circulating Orange calumnies, I have no objection—I am quite ready—to attenuate it to any extent desired. But my argument remains. We are wasting time for the purpose of perpetrating jobbery. It is all very well for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) and his friends to have this Debate going on, but, so far as we are concerned, we are sick and tired of

seeing this jobbery perpetrated, and I think it is quite time for us to divide.

(11.53.) EARL COMPTON (Yorkshire, Barnsley): I do not know if I may be allowed a few words on the question of adjourning over to-morrow. (Cries of "Decided!") As I understand, the question is whether we should adjourn over to-morrow. ("No, no; that is decided!") I have no wish whatever to put the House to the trouble of a Division or anything of that kind; but I believe I shall be within my right if I move that the Debate be adjourned till to-morrow. ("No, no!") At all events I speak to the Question of Adjournment of the Debate, and whether it shall be resumed to-morrow or not. ("No, no!") Are we going to have a meeting?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of Order. I wish to ask you, Sir, is it not the fact that at the beginning of business to-day the House, by Resolution, decided that at its rising to-night it should adjourn to Thursday? Is it competent for the hon. Member now to go back on that Resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is quite correct. A Resolution was passed this afternoon, "That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday." That question is therefore settled.

EARL COMPTON: I can then only speak to the Question of the Adjournment of the Debate. I cannot understand why the Debate is going to be adjourned at all. It seems to me—I do not know what arrangements have been made between the Government and the Front Opposition Bench—but it does seem to me that the time of the country is being wasted. We are having speech after speech, from either side of the House, but I should have thought we have discussed the question of Ireland quite sufficiently during the last six years. We have all made up our minds how we shall vote

when the Division is called. We have not now a question before us as regards Ireland or any part of the Newcastle Programme; the only question at the moment is whether the Government are to meet with an adverse vote or not. The Party opposite will vote with the Government. The Liberal Party will vote against the Government. I do not include in the Liberal Party those who, still sitting on this side of the House, have no claim to the name of Liberals. Surely it is right that a protest should be made against this putting off of a decision. We do not want any more speeches. We are all quite well aware what we shall hear from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. We have all read his speeches delivered during the recent elections. Very able speeches they were; we have all read them, and we know the views of the right hon. Gentleman. We do not want to listen to another declaration of these views. His speech will have absolutely no effect whatever on the Division that will take place. He used, I think, all the force he has at command during the late elections, and great force it is. He will certainly not wean a single vote from this side of the House to the support of his views when the Division takes place on Thursday. Why it should be deferred to Thursday I do not know. It would have been perfectly easy to have carried through the Debate in two nights instead of spreading it over three.

MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN :  
Why debate at all ?

EARL COMPTON : I quite agree with the right hon. Gentleman. Why debate at all ? We are all ready to go to a vote, and perhaps the vote will be taken a great deal earlier if the right hon. Gentleman does not speak. The question for six years has been before the country whether the present Government should remain in Office. That question is now decided, and can-

*Earl Compton*

not be altered by any speeches here. It has been decided by the country that Her Majesty's present Government must resign, and they will have to resign. I think it would have been infinitely better to have concluded the Debate in two nights. Everyone worth hearing would have been heard, and we should have been spared some of the speeches we have had to listen to, but which have been perfectly useless in regard to the question before us. For my part, I think the country will view this dragging out of the Debate with a great deal of discontent and dissatisfaction. There is no question of policy towards Ireland now to decide, the question is confidence or no confidence in Her Majesty's Government.

It being Midnight, the Motion for the Adjournment lapsed, and the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Thursday.

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

## MOTION.

## ADJOURNMENT.

(12.4.) MR. TIMOTHY HEALY (Louth, N.): I observe that the Government have entirely abrogated one of their functions a few days too soon, and, therefore, I have much pleasure in moving, "That this House do now adjourn."

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
"That this House do now adjourn."—  
(*Mr. Timothy Healy.*)

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at five minutes  
after Twelve o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Thursday, 11th August, 1892.*

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath; and two other Members made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

## QUESTIONS.

PROPOSED POST OFFICE AT  
KILBANNON.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General has he considered the desirability of establishing a post office at Kilbannon, County Galway?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir JAMES FERGUSON, Manchester, N.E.): I regret that on inquiry it is found that the letters are far too few to warrant the cost of establishing a sub-office. But orders have been given for fixing a wall letter box.

## BRITISH MISSION TO AFGHANISTAN.

MR. J. SEYMOUR KEAY (Elgin and Nairn): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India intend sending a British Mission to the Ameer of Afghanistan, with Lord Roberts at its head; if the Ameer will consent to receive it; and has the proposed Mission arisen out of the affair of Bajour, and to what object or objects is it addressed?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. G. N. CURZON, Lancashire, S.W., Southport): Her Majesty's Government are desirous that a meeting should take place between the Ameer and a British officer representing the Government of India, to discuss various questions of frontier policy; but the matter has not reached a stage at which it would be possible to give any detailed information.

THE PRISONER CORMICAN IN  
DUNDRUM ASYLUM.

MR. J. J. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) for Mr. L. P. HAYDEN

VOL. VII. [FOURTH SERIES.]

(Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what is the term for which a prisoner named Cormican, now detained in Dundrum Asylum, Dublin, for alleged complicity in the attack on Weston House, County Galway, was sentenced; how much of the term has expired; and whether, considering his conduct and the state of his mind, this prisoner can now be released, in view of the fact that another prisoner sentenced to a longer term at the same time has been since released?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): The convict referred to was sentenced to ten years' penal servitude on 2nd August, 1883, so that nine years of the term have expired. From the Report of the resident physician at Dundrum Asylum it appears that the man's mental condition is such as to render his release inadvisable.

ALLEGED ASSAULT BY A NATIONAL  
TEACHER.

MR. J. J. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.) for Mr. L. P. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an old man named Lettice was attacked when going home on the night of the 12th July by a party led by Joseph Boylan, national teacher, Castlejordan, County Meath, whilst the former was returning from voting; and whether Boylan's conduct will be brought under the notice of the Commissioners of National Education?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): So far as the police can ascertain, there is no foundation for the charge in this question against the national teacher mentioned.

## TRAWLING ON THE SCOTCH COAST.

MR. J. G. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that steam trawlers are regularly working within the three mile limit on the coasts of Ross and Cromarty; and what steps, if any, have been taken by the Government to enforce the law relating to trawling?

P



\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir CHARLES J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): I am informed that no complaints of illegal trawling on the coasts of Ross and Cromarty have been received for several months, and I am not aware that steam trawlers are at present working there. Five vessels are engaged in watching for illegal trawling on the coasts of Scotland, and a sixth vessel was stationed for some time on the east coast during the present summer. There have been twelve prosecutions this year and seven convictions.

#### TYPHOID FEVER IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.

MR. J. G. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware of an epidemic of typhus fever in various parts of the Island of Lewis, especially in Carloway; and what steps, if any, have been taken to deal with it, and improve the sanitary condition of the infected districts?

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir CHARLES J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): No information has reached any of the officials concerned as to the alleged epidemic of typhus fever; but inquiry is being made, and if necessity arises steps will at once be taken to deal with it.

#### ENSIGN FOR THE IRISH FISHERY DEPARTMENT.

MR. TIMOTHY HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland who selected the colour of the ensign for the Irish Fishery Department which has recently been adopted; are there any letters or minutes respecting the colour of the flag; and by whose order was it settled that no portion of the flag should be green?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): The Inspectors of Irish Fisheries are all absent from Dublin on duty in the country. I learn by telegraph that the question of the flag has not yet been submitted to the newly-constituted Board.

MR. HEALY: Is Mr. Cecil Roche also absent from Dublin?

\*MR. JACKSON: I presume so.

MR. HEALY: May I ask when this question will be considered? It has been stated in the newspapers that the design does not include the national colour.

\*MR. JACKSON: I have no knowledge on the subject. As I have said, the Inspectors are away, and I can only give the House such information as I have received.

#### THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

MR. TIMOTHY HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if any suggestion was held out to the Royal Irish Constabulary or any of them of a bonus for special work during recent years, and was any recommendation of the kind made by the heads of the force to the Government?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I am informed that no suggestion of the nature indicated in this question was held out to the Royal Irish Constabulary by the authorities, nor was any recommendation of the kind made to the Government by the heads of the force.

#### FAIR RENT SUB-COMMISSION IN COUNTY CAVAN.

MR. E. F. V. KNOX (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether Mr. Commissioner Wrench took part in naming the Sub-Commissioners recently told off to fix rents in Cavan on the Lanesborough and other estates?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): The Land Commissioners report that all the sittings of the Sub-Commissioners are arranged by the three Commissioners sitting together, having regard to the number of cases outstanding in the several counties, but without any regard to particular estates; and that Mr. Wrench had taken his part in such arrangements, but that he was not aware that there were any cases on the Lanesborough Estate, nor does he know by what Sub-Commissioners they were heard.

**THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD  
AND THE CAVAN TOWN COMMISSIONERS.**

MR. E. F. V. KNOX (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain on what grounds the Local Government Board have sought to recover from the Town Commissioners of Cavan expenses in connection with a loan which was never obtained for them; what were these expenses; and under what Statute the demand was made?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): The claim of the Local Government Board referred to was in respect of expenses incurred in connection with a local inquiry held by them on an application made by the Town Commissioners of Cavan for sanction to a loan for the purpose of erecting a Town Hall, in pursuance of Section 4 of the Public Health (Ireland) Amendment Act, 1884. The amount of this claim is £9 2s. 8d., being £2 4s. 8d. for advertising and £6 18s. for shorthand writer, and has been made under Section 210 of the Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1878, as incorporated under Section 1 of the Public Health (Ireland) Amendment Act, 1884, under which latter Statute the application to the Board had been made.

**PARTY DISTURBANCES IN ULSTER.**

MR. E. F. V. KNOX (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that party riots, in which the Orangemen were in each case the aggressors, have recently taken place at Caledon, Coagh, Coalisland, Lurgan, Portadown, and other places in Ulster; whether he is aware that in many cases the police and magistrates have taken insufficient means to protect the victims of outrage; and that at Caledon an attempt was made to attack a mill in which Catholics are employed; and what steps will be taken to prosecute those who have incited to this and similar outrages?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): The Constabulary authorities report that party disturbances have recently occurred at Caledon, Coalisland, Portadown, and Stewartstown; but that there are no places in which insufficient means were taken by the police and magistrates to prevent anticipated disturbances or protect victims of outrage, nor was any attempt made to attack a mill at Caledon. I have no information as to which side is considered the aggressors, but inquiries are proceeding as regards the disturbances, and three prosecutions have already been directed against the principal parties concerned.

MR. KNOX: I was unable to hear the whole of the right hon. Gentleman's answer; but may I ask him whether any steps have been taken against those who have in public speeches endeavoured to raise a feeling against the employment of Catholic workmen?

\*MR. JACKSON: I have no information suggesting that any such speeches were made.

MR. KNOX: Has the right hon. Gentleman seen the report of a speech alleged to have been delivered at Caledon by the hon. Member for South Tyrone, in whose constituency that place is, in which it was said that on the passing of a Home Rule Bill not a single Catholic would be employed in a mill in the whole of Ulster?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to say that I made no such statement.

**DISTURBANCES IN PORTADOWN.**

MR. M. McCARTAN (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he received from the Town Commissioners of Portadown a resolution adopted at their meeting on the 1st instant, calling upon the Government to grant an inquiry into the riots at Portadown in July last; whether his attention has been called to the report of their proceedings, as published in the *Portadown News* of the 6th instant, from which it appears that most serious charges of misconduct were brought against the police by the Town Commissioners; whether any inquiry has been held, and if any evidence has

been given in support of this charge; and whether he will state under what circumstances Sergeant M'Rudden, who had considerable local knowledge and who could have identified the rioters, was removed from Portadown within a few days of the commencement of the riots?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): The Constabulary Authorities report that a resolution, of the nature referred to, from the Town Commissioners of Portadown was received a few days ago, and the matter is being fully investigated. No charges of misconduct against the police have been preferred by the Town Commissioners to the police authorities in Portadown; but inquiries have been already instituted, and are still proceeding. In regard to the newspaper report referred to, local inquiry is being made on the subject-matter of the last paragraph.

#### THE CASE OF PRIVATE THOMAS BROWN.

MR. THOMAS HEALY (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the case of Private Thomas Brown, of the 1st Battalion Leinster Regiment of Foot, who was discharged in May, 1892, in consequence of ill-health, which was the result of sunstroke received while on service with the colours in India; and whether, under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that his conduct and character were described in his discharge as being "very good," Private Brown will be declared entitled to a pension?

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The medical history of the man does not show that he suffered from sunstroke. He was in hospital in consequence of an outbreak of intemperance, which was certainly contrary to his usual habits. The Commissioners fully considered his claim to a pension before deciding against it.

#### ALLOTMENT LAND AT CHARD.

MR. E. STRACHEY (Somerset, S.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chelsea whether the Ecclesiastical Commissioners will undertake that

their allotment land at Chard, Somerset, lately offered by them for sale but withdrawn at the auction, shall not be sold to a private individual, but be offered to the local authority for the purposes of the Allotments Acts, 1887 and 1889; and whether, failing this offer being accepted, will the Ecclesiastical Commissioners retain the allotment land at Chard in their own hands, so that the allotment holders shall run no risk of their being deprived of the land?

MR. C. A. WHITMORE (Chelsea): The allotment land at Chard was withdrawn from the recent auction by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in order that the allotment holders should run no risk of being deprived of their land. The Commissioners are prepared to treat with the local authority for a sale to them of the allotment land; and in the event of any failure to come to terms, the Commissioners are prepared to give an assurance that the land shall not be sold without giving the local authority the refusal.

#### ALLOWANCE FOR CUSTOMS OFFICERS' UNIFORMS.

MR. C. J. DARLING (Deptford): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether some officers of Customs have, on superannuation, received a proportionate part of the value of their uniform in addition to the superannuation allowance calculated on their salaries; and whether such an allowance will be made to Mr. Giles Helyer, a retired outdoor officer of H. M. Customs?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University) (who replied): The allowance of uniform clothing to principal coast officers of the second class, outdoor officers, and boatmen of the Customs has, since 11th January, 1892, been treated as a pensionable emolument, and the actual contract price of uniform clothing at the time of retirement of an officer of either of the above-mentioned grades has been included in the statement of his official income on which the amount of his pension is calculated. The concession made at the above date was not retrospective. Giles Helyer, formerly an outdoor officer of the Customs in London, retired on a pension in July,

*Mr. M. McCartan*

1887, and did not, therefore, have the benefit of the addition of the cost price of his uniform clothing to his pensionable income.

**THE BRITISH CONSUL AT NEW YORK  
AND THE CREW OF THE S.S.  
"GODOLPHIN."**

MR. JOSEPH H. WILSON (Middlesbrough): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the conduct of Her Majesty's Consul at New York, who is alleged to have neglected his duty in not protecting the seamen of the steamship "Godolphin," who were discharged before him from that vessel on the 14th January last, and who were entitled under the Merchant Shipping Act, owing to the expiration of the articles of agreement, to have their passages paid to the United Kingdom, and their wages up to their arrival at some port in the United Kingdom, and if he is aware of the fact that the British Consul, in a letter to the General Secretary of the Seamen's Union, intimated that the men had received such compensation, and that afterwards, in a letter to the Board of Trade, stated he had instructed the owners to pay the men twenty-three days' wages, and whether he is aware the said twenty-three days' wages still remain unpaid, as the owners of the steamship "Godolphin" repudiate their liability; what steps, if any, does he propose to take with respect to the alleged neglect of duty by Her Majesty's Consul at New York, and if any steps will be taken to compel the owners to pay to the crew of the "Godolphin" the money to which they are entitled; and, seeing the many complaints against British Consuls abroad as to their treatment of British seamen, whether Her Majesty's Government will at an early date appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the conduct of such Consuls, and the various charges of neglect of duty which officials of the Seamen's Union are prepared to prefer against a number of Consuls in several foreign ports?

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I am aware of the circumstances relating to the "Godolphin," as stated in the question; but I

see no reason to suppose that Her Majesty's Consul General at New York neglected his duty in the matter. On the contrary, he appears to have seen that the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act were complied with, and, in addition, to have done his best to secure the payment of the seamen's wages till their arrival in the United Kingdom. I therefore do not propose to take any steps with regard to his alleged neglect, and I have no power to compel the owners of the "Godolphin" to pay the wages in dispute. The question of their liability can only be decided by a Court of Law, at the suit of the seamen themselves. With regard to the last paragraph of the hon. Member's question, the matter is one rather for the Foreign Office than for the Board of Trade. I can only say that no evidence has been placed before me that would justify the appointment of a Select Committee to make the inquiries he suggests.

**RIVER OWENMORE FISHERIES.**

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that a number of fishermen of Brandon and Castle Gregory have been prosecuted by the Limerick Board of Fishery Conservators, and fined in sums varying from £5 to 2s. 6d., for fishing at the mouth of the River Owenmore; is he further aware that the question of the limits within which fishing is forbidden on this river is now in dispute, and that an inquiry into the matter by the Fishery Commissioners is being made; and whether, in view of the uncertainty at present existing as to the public rights of fishing in the river, the fines imposed will be remitted; and whether, in view of the fact that the district in question is one of those scheduled as a seaboard congested district, it would be possible to lessen the restrictions upon the fishing industry so as to permit of the better employment of the people?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (MR. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I am informed that the prosecutions referred to have taken place. The inquiry in regard to the River Owenmore has been fixed by the Inspectors of Fisheries for the 16th instant, when,

no doubt, all the circumstances will receive careful consideration.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: But, meantime, what happens to the men upon whom fines have been inflicted?

\*MR. JACKSON: I suppose they will pay the fines.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: Have they?

\*MR. JACKSON: I do not know.

#### THE DISTURBANCES IN PAHANG.

DR. G. B. CLARK (Caithness): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether anything has been done to restore order in Pahang; and whether the murderers of the two British subjects had been apprehended, or any steps taken to secure their apprehension?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Baron H. DE WORMS, Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Governor of the Straits Settlements has been taking active steps for restoring order in Pahang, not only by means of the forces belonging to the State, but by the aid of armed forces borrowed from the neighbouring protected States. In the last Report received from him it is stated under date of the 18th July that "at present there is no opposition to the Government in any part of the State, and all is quiet." The efforts to apprehend the murderers referred to and other offenders have, however, not as yet been successful, owing to the difficulties of pursuit presented by the natural features of the country.

#### ROADS IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.

MR. J. G. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that in the Park district of the Island of Lewis there are ten townships containing 2,000 inhabitants wholly without roads; whether the road rates are levied upon the ratepayers; and whether any grant has been made for the construction of roads in the district?

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir CHARLES J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): I am aware that there is a considerable population in the Park district without proper road communication, though I do not know the number of townships involved. The

Mr. W. L. Jackson

rates are levied on the ratepayers under Statute. The Government have been inquiring into the necessities of that and other parts of the country as regards additional roads, but the matter was not sufficiently advanced to warrant them in proposing any grant for that purpose this year.

#### DR. GREIG'S CLAIM AGAINST THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what steps have been taken in regard to the claim for compensation made by Dr. James A. Greig, one of the Missionaries of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, against the Chinese Government for the outrage committed by Chinese soldiers at Tu Seve Hia, near Kirin, on the 7th of August, 1891; and whether the claim is being pressed by the representative of the British Government in China?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): Her Majesty's Minister at Peking has demanded compensation from the Chinese Government for the outrage committed on Dr. Greig, but no definite result has yet been obtained. Her Majesty's Government are, however, in telegraphic communication on the subject with Sir John Walsham, who is pressing the claim upon the Chinese Government.

#### IRISH CROWN SOLICITORS AND PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Solicitor General for Ireland whether there is any rule prohibiting officials in the Public Service taking part in contested elections; and if the rule applies to gentlemen filling the office of Crown Solicitor in Ireland?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. E. CARSON, Dublin University): Crown Solicitors and Sessional Crown Solicitors in Ireland are prohibited by rules regulating their office from acting, directly or indirectly, as agents at, or in preparation for, any election on behalf of any candidate for representation in Parliament of their respective counties, or any borough or

town within the same. I cannot give the hon. Member any information as to the rules regulating Departments of the Public Service other than the Law Department.

#### TRAINING FOR NURSES AND THE TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACTS.

MR. H. HOBHOUSE (Somerset, E.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education if he will explain on what grounds the Science and Art Department have refused to sanction the expenditure of public money by the County Councils acting under the Technical Instruction Acts on the training of sick nurses in hospitals and institutions, although they allow payment for lectures on sick nursing; and whether, in view of the great importance of providing properly trained nurses for the poor, especially in the country districts, the Department will re-consider and modify their decision?

\*THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE, Kent, Dartford): By the 8th section of the Technical Instruction Act, technical instruction is declared not to include teaching the practice of any trade or industry or employment; and, therefore, the Department could not sanction the expenditure of money by the County Councils on what is avowed to be the training of sick nurses. Lectures on sick nursing, or instruction on its principles, are not open to the same objection. The Department, while fully realising the importance of providing properly trained nurses for the poor, is unable to modify its decision in view of the terms of the Act.

#### ILLEGAL DISTRAINT.

MR. E. H. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a case heard at Worship Street Police Court on Saturday last, in which complaint was made against a bailiff of having illegally taken possession of a woman's mangle, which was her means of livelihood, when the learned magistrate decided that the defendant had committed an illegal distress, but said that the only remedy which he

could give to the complainant was to order the return of the mangle on payment of the rent; and whether, having regard to the frequency of similar cases of illegal distress, he will bring this case under the notice of the Solicitor to the Treasury, with a view to proceedings being taken against the bailiff in the County Court, under Section 7 of the Law of Distress Amendment Act, 1888, and Rule 12 of the Rules made thereunder?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): Yes, Sir, I have directed that the papers referring to this case be sent to the Solicitor to the Treasury, with a view to compel the return of the mangle which the bailiff illegally distrained, and to such further proceedings as may be deemed proper under the Statute referred to.

#### OUTBREAK OF ANTHRAX IN SUSSEX.

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he has received any Report upon the outbreak of anthrax on a farm in Chalvington, Sussex, in the occupation of Mr. Woodhams in June last; how many cattle have died or been affected by the disease; whether it is true that one or more of the farm servants died of the disease; whether any steps were taken by the Department, by advice or otherwise, to assist the tenant in dealing with the disease; and whether the law permits of compensation being paid for the loss of the cattle?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. H. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Yes, Sir, I have received copies of the Reports made by the Medical Officer of Health and the Sanitary Inspector on the subject of the outbreak of anthrax to which my hon. Friend refers. Twenty-one cattle and two horses have been attacked with the disease, and all have died, whilst a farm servant, by whom one of the animals was killed, became infected with the disease, with, I regret to say, a fatal result. At my desire, the Chief Veterinary Inspector of the Board of Agriculture visited the farm on two occasions and gave all the

advice and assistance in his power. The law does not provide for the payment of compensation for the loss of animals, which, as in the present instance, have died of disease.

#### OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY BY NAVAL OFFICERS.

MR. MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbright): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will have inquiry made as to the circumstances under which the officers of H.M.S. "Garnet," at Callao, are said to have instituted a rifle competition on Sunday, 19th June, at San Lorenzo Island, and also to have taken a leading part in a regatta at Callao on Sunday, 26th June; and whether it is not contrary to Article I. of the Naval Discipline Act to employ the men on Sundays in boat races or rifle matches?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): This question has already been brought to the notice of the Admiralty, and a Report upon the matter has been called for from the Admiral on the station. I have no information as yet which will enable me to answer or give an opinion upon the second part of the question.

#### IRISH PROBATE DIVISION CLERKS.

MR. M. McCARTAN (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he has received a statement from the clerks in the district registries of the Probate Division of the High Court of Justice in Ireland, with reference to their claims to additional remuneration on account of their largely increased duties; and if he will state what reply has been given to them, or if anything has been done in the matter?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University): No; I have received no such statement.

#### DISTRICT REGISTRIES FOR WRITS FOR BELFAST AND CORK.

MR. M. McCARTAN (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Solicitor General for Ireland whether, considering that there are eighty-three district registries for the issue of writs of summons in England and only one in Ireland, he will now

*Mr. H. Chaplin*

say if anything has yet been done for the purpose of establishing such district registries in Belfast and Cork?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. E. CARSON, Dublin University): The answer to the question of the hon. Member is in the negative. The Lord Chancellor informs me he has not received any communication whatever upon the subject, and, so far as he is aware, there is no practical inconvenience from the present system.

MR. McCARTAN: On a previous occasion when I asked a question on the subject I was informed that the Lord Chancellor was considering it. Has any consideration been given to it?

MR. CARSON: I can only say that, at an interview I had with the Lord Chancellor this morning, he gave me the information I have just given.

#### DUBLIN AND CORK MAILS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Postmaster General what stage the negotiations of the Post Office Department with the Great Southern and Western Railway Company and the other parties interested respecting the acceleration of the mails from Dublin to Cork have reached; and when the new arrangement may be expected to come into force?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir JAMES FERGUSON, Manchester, N.E.): A definite proposal was made to the Great Southern and Western Railway Company, and declined by them. I am in further communication with the Treasury on the subject, but I cannot say whether any result is likely to be arrived at.

MR. HEALY: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the offer made to the Company was not less than the sum the right hon. Gentleman himself stated in the House to be a reasonable one?

SIR JAMES FERGUSON: The offer made to the Company was one which I hoped from previous communications they were likely to take, but I was disappointed in my expectations.

MR. HEALY: A less sum than that the right hon. Gentleman said was reasonable?

SIR JAMES FERGUSON: Yes.

**BENDUFF SLATE QUARRY ACCIDENT.**

MR. E. BARRY (Cork Co., S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any steps have yet been taken to recover the bodies of five of the nine men who were killed at the Benduff Slate Quarry, County Cork, and which still remain unrecovered; and whether, if the owners of the quarry have not taken any steps to recover these bodies, the Government will give any assistance to get the *débris* removed and the remains recovered?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I am informed that it is the case that five of the bodies of the men who were killed on the occasion referred to still remain unrecovered. Criminal proceedings have been instituted against the manager of the quarry in regard to the casualty.

MR. J. GILHOOLY (Cork Co., W.): Cannot the Government take any steps to compel the owners to proceed in the endeavour to recover the bodies?

\*MR. JACKSON: I am not aware that the Government have any power. There have been parallel cases in this country where bodies have not been recovered.

**DURRUS PETTY SESSIONS CLERK.**

MR. J. GILHOOLY (Cork Co., W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Petty Sessions Clerk recently appointed by the magistrates at Durrus resides at Bantry, a distance of twenty-six miles from part of the district for which he was appointed; and, if so, whether he will be required to reside in the Durrus Petty Sessions district?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I am informed that the Clerk of Petty Sessions for Durrus was at the time of his recent election likewise Clerk of Petty Sessions for Bantry, which is six-and-a-half miles distant from Durrus, and which he still holds, and where he still continues to reside under the regulations which allow a Clerk who holds two or more districts to live at or near one of the Courts of which he

is Clerk. No complaints have reached the Department of the Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks of any inconvenience being caused to the public in the matter.

MR. GILHOOLY: Does the right hon. Gentleman mean to say that there is no inconvenience for a person to have to travel twenty-six miles to find the Petty Sessions Clerk of the district?

\*MR. JACKSON: No complaints have reached the Department.

MR. GILHOOLY: Should not the Petty Sessions Clerk be compelled to reside within the district?

\*MR. JACKSON: I cannot take any action in the matter. The appointment rests with the magistrates, who presumably consult the convenience of the district.

**PLEURO-PNEUMONIA AND INOCULATION.**

MR. WILLIAM FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick's): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether it is intended to recommend the institution of scientific experiments to try the efficacy of inoculation as a preventive of pleuro-pneumonia, as the varied and general experience of the Colonies is almost entirely in favour of that system; and whether the Board of Agriculture for England and Scotland, and the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council of Ireland, will in future consult, as far as may be consistent with safety, the convenience of cattle traders, cowkeepers, and others interested in the imposition of restriction Orders which have the force of an Act of Parliament?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. H. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): It is not my intention to take the course suggested. Numerous experiments of various kinds have been made with a view of testing the value of inoculation as a preventive of pleuro-pneumonia; but experience has clearly shown that the disease can never be stamped out by such means. I may refer the hon. Member to the Report of the Departmental Committee of 1888, which is very clear on this point. With reference to the imposition of restrictive Orders, I can assure the hon. Member it has always



been the desire of the Board of Agriculture to adopt the course suggested by him, so far as it was possible to do so consistently.

Mr. FIELD: Have the experiments to which the right hon. Gentleman refers been instituted in foreign countries, or are they the results of experiments which have been tried here?

Mr. CHAPLIN: The experiments to which I refer have been made, I believe, in foreign countries as well as in this country, and with the result I have endeavoured to describe.

#### SEIZURE OF MEAT.

Mr. WILLIAM FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick's): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state upon what authority the Medical Officers of Health in various towns throughout the country frequently exercise the power of seizing and destroying the bodies of animals that had been previously passed by a Government Inspector as sound in open market, without any compensation to the recent purchaser?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. H. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford) (who replied): The hon. Gentleman is in error in supposing that animals are passed as sound in open market by any Government Inspector, and the condition precedent to which he refers does not therefore exist. The power of a Medical Officer of Health to seize meat, &c., which appears to him to be unfit for the food of man, is contained in Section 116 of the Public Health Act, 1875, and meat, &c., so seized may be destroyed by order of a Justice.

#### MIXED TRAINS ON IRISH RAILWAYS.

Mr. WILLIAM FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick's): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Board of Trade will allow the Irish Railway Companies to attach passenger carriages to empty goods trains going to distant fairs all over the country, so that cattle dealers and others may be facilitated in travelling to carry on their business?

*Mr. H. Chaplin*

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The number of mixed trains to be allowed on Irish railways in exemption from the terms of the Orders made under the provisions of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, is at present under the consideration of the Board of Trade. I have no doubt that a certain number of mixed trains will be allowed; but in the interests of public safety I cannot hold out any hope that the companies will be permitted to attach passenger carriages to all their goods trains.

#### THE NEW FEVER HOSPITAL.

Mr. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Local Government Board have received information from the Metropolitan Asylums Board of their intention of erecting a new fever hospital; whether he is aware that the Metropolitan Asylums Board proposes to place that hospital on a site separated only by a railway embankment from a population of four thousand working people, and on low-lying ground in a neighbourhood frequently flooded by reason of the discharge of surface water; and whether, seeing that there is available ground not open to these objections within a distance of two miles, the Local Government Board will refuse their sanction to the erection of the hospital on the proposed site?

Mr. J. HOWARD (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Local Government Board is aware of the alarm which the renewed application by the Metropolitan Asylums Board, for the erection of a fever hospital in Tottenham, is exciting amongst the large population there, and of the opposition to it by all the Public Bodies in the district; and whether any reason has been shown for altering the decision come to by the Local Government Board last year to withhold their sanction from the scheme?

Mr. J. G. TALBOT (Oxford University): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been drawn to the fact that the accommodation for fever patients in the hospitals

of the Metropolitan Asylums Board is now very nearly exhausted; and whether, in the interests of the poorer inhabitants of London especially, he will consider the advisability of sanctioning the acquisition of a site on which temporary fever hospitals at least can be erected?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The President of the Local Government Board has had under his careful consideration the proposal of the managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District with reference to the erection of a new fever hospital. In the first place, he directed that a local inquiry should be held by Dr. Bridges and Mr. Hedley, the two Inspectors of the Metropolitan District, so that those who objected to the proposal might have an opportunity of stating their objections, and the objections might be fully before him. Since the inquiry the site has been visited by Major Tulloch and Mr. Gordon Smith, the Chief Engineering Inspector and the architect of the Board, in order that he might also have the opinion of these officers as to the suitability of the site. With regard to the objections to the site which are suggested by the question, the land proposed to be purchased is about fifteen acres in extent, and therefore admits of a considerable distance, in addition to the width of the railway embankment, being interposed between the hospital buildings and any dwellings on the other side of the embankment. It is also to be observed that the Royal Commission on Small-pox and Fever Hospitals, in their Report in 1882, state that—

“All evidence goes to show that well-conducted fever hospitals involve no appreciable risk to the neighbourhood.”

And this view is supported by the results of inquiries instituted by officers of the Board. With regard to the question that the site is on low-lying ground in a neighbourhood frequently flooded by the discharge of surface water, he is informed that the average level of the site is about fifty feet above Ordnance datum, and that the site is about twenty-five feet above the level of the River Lea into which flood water is conducted. The central portion of the land, which is the part on which buildings would be placed, has an

elevation of not less than five feet above the ground at the extremities both north and south. There appear, therefore, to be no circumstances as regards flooding of the land by surface water which would render it unsuitable for the erection of buildings. It is, of course, essential that hospital buildings for the Metropolitan District should be within such a distance as to enable patients suffering from acute infectious disease to be conveyed there with safety. Careful search has been made for a suitable site for a hospital for the North-Eastern parts of the Metropolis within a similar distance to that of the site in question, but without success. Assuming that a site could be obtained at a distance of two miles from the proposed site, the distance would be too great. The President of the Local Government Board, having regard to the urgent necessity for provision being immediately made in consequence of the present epidemic of fever in the Metropolis, and to the fact that the managers have been unable to find any more suitable place in the North-Eastern part of London, considers that he has no alternative but to assent to the purchase by the managers of the land in question, for the provision of accommodation for fever patients; but he will limit his assent to the erection of buildings to be used temporarily, and in which fever patients will be received.

#### RAILWAYS IN THE HIGHLANDS.

MR. D. H. MACFARLANE (Argyll) for Dr. G. B. CLARK (Caithness): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether any arrangements have been entered into with regard to the construction of any of the proposed railways to the West Highlands?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Her Majesty's Government have accepted an offer, made by the promoters of the railway from Fort William to Mallaig, to construct the railway and the necessary harbour at Mallaig, provided that a dividend of three per cent. for thirty years is guaranteed on the sum of £260,000, being the estimated cost of the line, and a grant of £30,000 is made from public funds towards the cost of the harbour. It is understood that the line

when made will be worked by the North British Railway Company. It is not known what progress has been made by the promoters; and there is some uncertainty whether they are yet in a position to carry out their proposals.

#### PENSIONS AND SUPERANNUATIONS.

MR F. S. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the Return relating to pensions and superannuation allowances, ordered to be printed 21st March, 1892, will be issued?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): For the purposes of the Return relating to pensions and superannuation allowances, which was ordered by the House in March last, it is necessary to obtain Returns from more than 1,000 Local Authorities. In a number of cases the Returns are still outstanding, but every effort will be made to secure the issue of the Returns at as early a date as practicable.

#### IRISH APPOINTMENTS.

MR. TIMOTHY HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether Mr. Olphert has been appointed Resident Magistrate in the room of Mr. Cecil Roche, appointed Fishery Commissioner?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I am informed that the Lord Lieutenant has made the appointment referred to, and that it was duly published in the *Dublin Gazette* on the 9th instant.

MR. HEALY: Was Mr. Olphert appointed in the room of Mr. Cecil Roche, and was he not agent to his father on whose estate extensive evictions took place?

\*MR. JACKSON: I am afraid I cannot give an answer as to whether he was appointed in the place of Mr. Cecil Roche. There were two vacancies, and it is impossible for me to say, therefore, whose place he fills. I understand Mr. Olphert is the son of a landowner.

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

MR. HEALY: Upon whose recommendation was Mr. Olphert appointed, and is he a gentleman whose legal knowledge is considered satisfactory?

\*MR. JACKSON: I think there can be no doubt on that point. I understand he is a gentleman who has a very good standing at the Bar, that he has conducted legal business for the Government, and that he is in every way qualified for the position.

MR. HEALY: Who recommended him?

[No answer was given.]

#### THE COLUMBIAN LOAN.

MR. H. SETON-KARR (St. Helen's): I wish to ask a question—of which I have given private notice—whether I can be afforded any information as to the loan of £150,000 to the Government of British Columbia for colonisation purposes, and if the details of the loan have been arranged?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University): I have already stated, in answer to a previous question, that no loan whatever has been made under the British Columbia Loan Act.

MR. SETON-KARR: I wish to know if any of the details have been arranged?

SIR JOHN GORST: No loan has been made; therefore there can be no details.

MR. SETON-KARR (later) said: I wish to press my question with reference to the loan of £150,000. I do not ask whether any money has been advanced. What I want to know is, have the details been arranged? I should like the question to be answered now, as probably when the House again meets the right hon. Gentleman will not be in a position to answer.

SIR JOHN GORST: I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon for misunderstanding the question he put to me without notice. I am afraid, as the question now stands, that I must ask him to give notice.

#### INDIAN CURRENCY.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the report in the *Times* of to-day stating that the ques-

tion of closing the Mints of India to the free coinage of silver was under discussion in Calcutta; and whether any communication has been received from the Indian Government on the subject?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. G. N. CURZON, Lancashire, S.W., Southport): The Secretary of State has seen the telegram in the *Times*, and he has received a copy of a letter on the subject addressed by the President of the Indian Currency Association to the Government of India. Some correspondence on the general subject has also taken place between the Secretary of State and the Government of India in connection with the approaching International Conference.

MR. SMITH: Arising out of that answer, I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether in the Instructions given to the British delegates to the International Conference they will be allowed a fair opportunity of discussing all the recommendations proposed at the Conference, subject to ultimate reference to the Government?

MR. SPEAKER: Such a question as that should be put on the Paper.

#### STRABANE POST OFFICE.

LORD FREDERICK HAMILTON (Tyrone, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General a question of which I have given private notice—whether, in deciding as to the new post office at Strabane, he has taken into consideration the representations made by business people of the town that the proposed situation will be most inconvenient?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir JAMES FERGUSON, Manchester, N.E.): Careful consideration has been given to the whole question of the new post office at Strabane, and there seems no doubt that the scheme decided upon affords the only suitable means at present available of providing satisfactory accommodation of a reasonably permanent character for the duties.

#### THE SCOTCH CROFTERS.

MR. D. MACGREGOR (Inverness-shire): I wish to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer the following question of which I have given him private notice: Is it with the knowledge and approval of the Government that a company is now being formed to induce the crofters and fishermen in the Highlands of Scotland to emigrate to British Columbia, whilst a vast area of land remains uncultivated in their own country?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University) (who replied): My right hon. Friend informs me that the Government have no knowledge whatever of the facts alleged by the hon. Member.

#### SIR CHARLES EUAN-SMITH'S MISSION TO MOROCCO.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (King's Lynn): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in compliance with Sir Charles Euan-Smith's request, a reply was sent to his despatch of 24th May, 1892, proposing to submit to His Majesty the Sultan of Morocco for his acceptance an agreement for the immediate suspension of final relinquishment by Her Majesty's Government of the right of according British protection to Moorish subjects; and, if so, whether he has any objection to laying that reply on the Table of the House; also, whether he can state what was the nature of the proposals contained in the document which Sir Charles Euan-Smith stated in his despatch of 29th July, 1892, that he tore up and returned to the Sultan's Minister as partaking of the nature of an insult?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): In reply to the first question, I have to say that Sir Charles Euan-Smith was authorised to make proposals, which he sent home both by telegram and despatch, to the Sultan, and it was only owing to inadvertence that the telegram authorising him to make these proposals was not inserted in the Blue Book. With reference to the second question, we have been informed by

Sir Charles Euan-Smith that the document he tore up was in the nature of a draft Treaty; but its provisions were entirely different from those which the Sultan had already at that time accepted and promised to sign.

#### CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD REPORTS.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when will Reports from the Board for the congested parts of Ireland be published; and if any steps are being taken to establish a technical school for fishery purposes in Galway?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): In the Act constituting the Congested Districts Board, that Board is required to make a Return once in every year to the Lord Lieutenant of their proceedings. The Report for 1892 will be presented in due course. The Board has this year issued a preliminary statement, which was presented to Parliament in June. Three fishing institutions have been established by the Board in the County of Galway—in the Islands of Arran and Boffin, and at Ardmore—for the purpose of imparting practical instruction to fishermen in the catching and curing of fish.

#### THE M'KINLEY TARIFF.

MR. A. J. MUNDELLA (Sheffield, Brightside): I wish to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a question of which I have given private notice—whether at any time since the enactment of the M'Kinley Tariff Act any representations or remonstrances have been addressed to the United States Government by Her Majesty's Minister at Washington; and whether any communications have been received at the Foreign Office relating to interviews or discussions which are said to have taken place between Her Majesty's Ministers and Mr. Blaine, the late Secretary of State, on the subject?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): In reply to the first question of the right hon. Gentleman, no repre-

sentations or remonstrances have been addressed to the United States Government by Her Majesty's Minister at Washington with regard to the M'Kinley Tariff Act. In reply to the second question, no communication relating to interviews or discussions which are said to have taken place have been reported to the Foreign Office.

#### MOTION.

#### SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE (EXEMPTION FROM THE STANDING ORDER).

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I beg to move—

“That the proceedings on the Motion for an Address in answer to Her Majesty's Speech, if under discussion at Twelve o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order ‘Sittings of the House.’”

Question put, and agreed to.

#### ORDER OF THE DAY.

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH. [ADJOURNED DEBATE.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [8th August], “That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, as followeth:—

‘MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal Subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled, beg leave to thank Your Majesty for the most Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.”—(Mr. Barton.)

And which Amendment was,

At the end of the Question to add the words, “That we feel it, however, to be our humble duty to submit to Your Majesty that it is essential that Your Majesty's Government should possess the confidence of this House and of the Country, and respectfully to represent to Your Majesty that such confidence is not reposed in the present Advisers of Your Majesty.”—(Mr. Asquith.)

Question again proposed, “That those words be there added.”

Debate resumed.

Mr. J. W. Lowther

On Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.) rising to address the House,

MR. A. C. MORTON (Peterborough) said: I rise to Order, Sir. I desire to ask your ruling on a point of Order, as to whether the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Chamberlain) has not—by the proceedings of Tuesday night—lost his right to speak in this Debate, and I will refer you to what occurred in this House only last year. On 26th May, I myself, at a Morning Sitting at 6.44 of the clock, moved the Adjournment of the Debate in these words—

“I beg to move the Adjournment of the Debate, as it is impossible, in the short time at our disposal, to consider all the questions we desire to raise.”

That took about half a minute, Sir. That was at 6.44, and at 6.50, after you had refused to accept the Motion to put the Closure, the Debate was talked out exactly as it was last Tuesday. On the next day the House met, 28th May, the Debate was resumed. I considered that I had lost my right to resume the Debate; but as the second speaker I commenced to make a speech, not thinking that I had entirely forfeited the right to speak in the Debate, but you interrupted me in these words—

“MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has exhausted his right to speak. I see he has already spoken on the Main Question.

MR. MORTON: I only moved the Adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: That is speaking on the Main Question.”

I, of course, have no desire whatever to stop the right hon. Gentleman, but as a very humble Member of this House, and there being probably other occasions on which I shall desire to speak, I want fully to preserve my right against all comers.

\*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is perfectly entitled to bring that precedent before the House, but I think there must be some misconception. The hon. Gentleman made a speech—it is true it was a short one—and subsequently the Closure was moved, which I declined to accept, and the Debate, not on the Main Question, as the hon. Gentleman put it, but on the Adjournment, was resumed. Subsequently the hon.

Gentleman did not rise in the House to resume the Debate, as he would have had a right to do; but he spoke afterwards in the course of the Debate. I think misconception must have arisen in consequence of the Closure having been moved on the Main Question and not on the Adjournment, and also owing to the fact that the hon. Gentleman did not rise at once to claim his privilege of resuming the Debate. If any misconception has taken place, it is too late to offer any apology to the hon. Gentleman for what occurred in the year 1891. The facts of the case are these—If an hon. Member moves the Adjournment and that Adjournment is not agreed to, he is held to have spoken on the Main Question when it is resumed; but when he moves the Adjournment of the Debate and that question is agreed to he is in possession of the House, and he may either resume the Debate immediately, or subsequently in the course of the Debate he is entitled to speak. I do not think there is any necessity for saying anything further. On Tuesday the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) moved the Adjournment of the Debate, and that was not accepted, but no Division took place against it. The House agreed to the Adjournment, and the right hon. Gentleman is in possession of the House. If it were otherwise no Debate could be resumed, because if any Gentleman moved the Adjournment of the Debate and anybody objected, without a Division, according to the theory now proposed, it would be impossible for the Debate to be resumed. But the hon. Gentleman was entitled to place the question before the House, and I hope I have stated fairly all the facts of the case.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: After the incident which has taken place I feel I ought to begin by tendering my thanks to the noble Lord the Member for Barnsley (Earl Compton). It will be within the recollection of the House that on Monday night, at a quarter to twelve o'clock, the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Leveson-Gower), on behalf of the right hon. Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), moved the Adjournment of the Debate. On

Tuesday night, following that precedent and in accordance with what I certainly believed was a general understanding, I at the same hour moved the Adjournment of the Debate. Thereupon the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for North Louth (Mr. Timothy Healy) got up and objected. I have noticed, Sir, that whenever it is desired to exhibit personal discourtesy towards any man, or any woman, the hon. and learned Gentleman always presents himself to accomplish it. If the Division had been taken, and if the objection to the Motion for Adjournment had been carried, we are now told by Mr. Speaker that I should have lost my right to take part in the Debate. No doubt that was what my noble Friend the Member for Barnsley foresaw.

EARL COMPTON (York, W.R., Barnsley): I am sorry to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, but I wish to explain at once, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, that I did not speak up to twelve o'clock with the intention of depriving him of the right to speak to-day. I was unaware of the Rule which we have just heard from the Chair; I was only rising to protest against having a three days' Debate instead of two.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: That is just what I was saying. I was just remarking that owing to the happy and friendly conduct of my noble Friend the device of the hon. and learned Member for North Louth was not successful, because my noble Friend talked out the Motion, and accordingly I am able to speak. I will venture to express the hope that after the Division which will take place to-day, and after right hon. Gentlemen who sit around me have obtained the object of their desires—from which, no doubt, I can humbly confess that the Party to which I belong has been the means of excluding them from the last six years—I say I hope that when they have obtained their desires they will themselves feel that the system of petty slights and of injurious language towards the Members of the Liberal Unionist Party should be finally abandoned. Sir, we have come back to the House a Party forty-eight strong, and I am told that in a short time we shall add another to

*Mr. Joseph Chamberlain*

our number. Sir, I would ask whether in the history of third Parties, who are always placed in a difficult position, there is any case in which such a Party has come back after a second General Election forty-nine strong to this House? My hon. and learned Friend the Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) talked about our dwindling numbers. Well, Sir, I am not certain that dwindling numbers are any greater proof of dwindling influence than are dwindling majorities, whether in East Fife or elsewhere. But, Sir, our influence in the country is not measured by our numbers in this House, and there is, I believe, a very simple test by which you can measure it. In 1885 there was a square fight in the country between the Conservatives and Liberals, and on that occasion the Conservatives came back to the House 249 strong. They had, however, at that time the support of the Irish vote in British constituencies. The hon. Member for the Scotland Division (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) has stated that that is worth forty seats. I think he exaggerates, as usual. Let us take it as worth twenty seats, then the number due to the Conservative strength alone was 229, and to-day the number of Unionists in this House is 315. The difference of eighty-six seats, counting 172 votes on a Division, is the measure of the influence of the Liberal Unionist Party, and in these days of political combination I would venture to point out that the addition of 172 would make the majority of the Opposition 212; and even if on a great Division, under these circumstances, they were to lose the support of the Irish vote they would still be in a majority of fifty-two. I only use these figures to point out to my hon. Friends that, after all, in spite of all they have done, we remain a certain political force, and I would say, with all respect to my hon. and learned Friend behind me, that I do not think he will lessen our influence in the country one bit by calling us either political apostates or an ill-starred abortion. Now, Sir, my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) said on Tuesday that this Debate was in his opinion most singular in the records of the House.

Sir, I agree with him, although I am afraid that we should differ a little when we came to describe what each of us believed to be the greatest of its singularities. My right hon. Friend says that the issue between the Unionists and the Home Rule Party has been decided by the country, and I agree with him. He says that from that verdict there is no appeal, and I agree with him. And then he goes on to say that under these circumstances it is irrelevant—I think he almost said it was impertinent—for us to do anything more than expel the Government from Office, without any curiosity whatever as to what was to follow it, as to the Government of the future which, with something more than his usual felicity, my right hon. Friend described as a “nebular hypothesis.” But my right hon. Friend is not altogether consistent, because in a later part of his speech he admitted that a Debate of this kind would not be altogether retrospective. He said it was natural that there should be some desire to have light thrown upon the future, for his part he was not even surprised at the application of pressure, and then he proceeded to give answers in writing to questions which were put to him by the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy). Well, now, Sir, I appeal to my right hon. Friend, is not that rather hard measure? Here are 315 Unionists, and we may not ask a single question; here are seventy-one Nationalist Irishmen, and they may ask five questions and get a civil answer. Sir, I have been studying the characteristics of nebulous bodies, and I find that now-a-days, by the employment of powerful telescopes and the latest inventions, these bodies are forced to disclose their secrets and can be resolved into their component atoms, and I have come to the conclusion that the hon. Member for North Longford must be one of the very latest and most powerful of these instruments, and I cannot help thinking that the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond) wishes he could borrow it. Now, Sir, I have said that I agree with my right hon. Friend as to the singularity of this Debate. I believe that the situation is absolutely unprecedented in English political history, though not,

perhaps, in the history of foreign countries which are also under Parliamentary Government. In France and Italy I have seen again and again that a combination of sections, very often in entire disagreement as to everything else, has accomplished the extrusion from power of the existing Government, and nobody in those countries have seemed to think it necessary to ask who was to follow. The act has been an act of destruction and condemnation, and there has been no attempt to proceed to construction or to substitution. But that is not the case in this country. Owing to the fact probably that we have not so many Parties, and that the Parties that we have are more homogeneous and clearly defined, in almost every case in which a Government has gone out of Office a Vote of Want of Confidence in the Government has implied a Vote of Confidence in the Opposition—in the Party coming to take their place, and the policy which that Party represented. Is that so to-day? I say you know you can put that Government in a minority of forty; you do not know that this Government will not be in a minority of one hundred. I have said that that is the rule—I believe almost the absolute rule—in English politics, but there is an exception. In 1859 there was a combination of sections to put out of Office the then Tory Government; it consisted of the friends of Lord Palmerston, of the friends of Lord Russell, of the Peelites, and the friends, of course, of Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden, and of the Irish Party; and at the time they put the Government out of Office I believe those Parties—and I speak in the recollection of my right hon. Friend—did not know what Government was going to follow or who was going to be at the head of it; and not only that they did not know, but that they had not the ordinary means of foreseeing what we have at the present time. What happened then? When these various sections had made up their differences, and had agreed to form a Government, they came back and met Parliament, produced their measures and their policy, asked for Supplies, took the opinion of the House of Commons, and asked its approval, and having got that they



were able to say that they had the confidence of the country and of the House of Commons. But how different it is to-day. To-day we are to put out that Government. The Government which comes in is immediately to prorogue Parliament, and for five, it may be for six months, this "nebular hypothesis" is going to carry on the whole administration of the country; it is going to decide its policy; it is going to exercise all the prerogatives of Government, and neither the House of Commons nor the country knows whether from the first moment of its existence it may not be in a minority. I will show that very soon. It is a strange and unexampled position, and yet right hon. Gentlemen on this side, backed and supported by hon. Gentlemen behind them, have endeavoured to stifle debate, and they are going without one word of explanation, without one word of information on important parts of their policy, to endeavour for these five or six months to carry out a policy which never has, which never could have, the approval of the majority of this country. I will just put a case to show what may be the result of this situation. What is the foreign policy of the Government of those who, to use the language of my right hon. Friend, may possibly be called upon to guide the Councils of the country? Some time ago there were speeches made by the right hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) and by the right hon. Member for Midlothian, and rightly or wrongly these speeches were believed by many persons in this country and by a large portion of the foreign Press to point to the desirability of an immediate, or, at all events, of a very early evacuation of Egypt, and the same speeches were understood to imply, if not hostility, at all events something akin to disapproval of the policy of the Triple Alliance. Now, is that to be the policy of the future Government?

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE (Edinburgh, Midlothian): I never touched the question.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Does my right hon. Friend say that he did not touch on the question of Egypt?

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-upon-Tyne): The Triple Alliance.

*Mr. Joseph Chamberlain*

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I beg my right hon. Friend's pardon. I was under the impression that the question of the position of Italy in regard to the Triple Alliance had formed a very distinct and a very important part of one of the speeches delivered by him. But if my right hon. Friend denies it I accept his contradiction, and will deal only with the question of Egypt. Now, Sir, there is a rumour—there are plenty of rumours—that Lord Rosebery is to be Foreign Secretary. I hope it is true, because the country has confidence in the conduct of foreign policy by Lord Rosebery. But why? Because it is believed that the policy of Lord Rosebery is distinctly opposed to the policy of my right hon. Friend, and of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle. If Lord Rosebery returns to the Foreign Office, I believe the country will have confidence in his administration. But suppose that rumour is not true? Then it is conceivable that we may wake up some morning in the course of the next five or six months and find that preparations are going on for the evacuation of Egypt, and the opinion of the House of Commons and of the country will never have been taken upon that step. I know that there is a certain opinion among some of my hon. Friends that the democracy of this country would favour that policy. I do not believe it. I do not believe that democracies—and I judge by the experience of the democracy of France, and, above all, of the United States of America—are anything but keenly sensitive to the honour and interests of the nation to which they belong, and I do not believe that the British democracy will favour a policy of scuttle; and so I say, if it should happen that this policy of evacuating Egypt should be the policy of the incoming Government, then it is my firm belief that though at the present moment the Opposition may have a majority of forty, the Government would be in an actual minority. But, Sir, the difficulty is not chiefly or entirely confined to the question of foreign policy. It is perfectly well known—it is an open secret—that on this side of the House and in the majority—I am speaking now of the British portion of the majority—there are different sections who have

different objects to which they attach an altogether different value. They may be all content to postpone these several objects for a greater and more dominant one, but when it comes to settling the precedence between the remainder it is not too much to say that very probably there may be differences of opinion. Have those differences been, or are they likely to be, reconciled before the present Government comes into Office? If they are, then I am perfectly prepared to admit that, so far as the Irish majority is concerned, you have a homogeneous Party. But if they are not reconciled, if they remain in the form in which the public Press has already made us acquainted with them, then I say you cannot count upon your majority for a single day. Some persons have complained—and it is not surprising under these circumstances—of what they have called the conspiracy of silence, which has been maintained. Here are all these various sections. Not one Representative of any single section has addressed the House. Well, Sir, this is an astonishing docility, but how long will it continue? I do not much wonder at the silence. There are only two things they could possibly talk about—they must talk either about the past or the future. If they talk about the past they might repeat, no doubt, the charges against the present Government which have been heard on a hundred platforms, but then they would be under the disadvantage that in this House they could be answered. Therefore, I am not surprised that they have preserved a discreet silence. But then as to the future. They might talk about the future. They might put forward, as their Irish allies have done, their desire for assurances. They know perfectly that if the assurances of any one section were granted, some other section might be displeased, and the displeasure of one section would be fatal to the hopes of all, and so again they have preserved a discreet silence. They prefer to wait for something to turn up. There are, however, two sections in the House whose taciturnity seems to me to be exceptionally strange. The first is the Welsh Members of Parliament. There are thirty-one of them, we are told by their own Resolution, who have been returned, and we know that the

first object of their constituents is the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church in Wales. They are content to postpone the realisation of their desire for a time, but they insist that it shall have the second place in the Liberal programme. Have they got any assurance to that effect? Did they hear the speech of the hon. Member for Waterford the other night when he said that though he and his friends would be willing to support the passage of British reforms, yet those reforms must not be questions which were of a nature to divert the attention of the British people or to make the Irish Question less dominant. Is there anybody who will say that a question so complex and so difficult and exciting so much interest in all classes of the community as the question of Disestablishment can be introduced into this House without diverting the attention of the whole British people? Therefore, that question is excluded by the mandate of the hon. Member for Waterford, who carries with him, in this and in other respects, the support of the other section of the Nationalist Party. Therefore, it appears to me that for Welsh Disestablishment the prospect of second place is not promising, and it is under these circumstances that I have wondered that these Representatives of the Welsh people have not thought it necessary to say something in this Debate. Well, Sir, the other section is the class of Members who profess especially to represent the cause of the Eight Hours Bill for miners. I should have thought their experience would have convinced them of the virtue of a little pressure. I do not think there is in the history of our politics—even in these times of rapid conversion—a more extraordinary instance of progress in regard to any question than that made by the right hon. Member for Midlothian between the time when he refused to receive a deputation and the time when, in the course of the election for Midlothian, he saw the representatives of the miners there and was able to give them a most satisfactory assurance that he was prepared to support the Eight Hours Bill with local option. I understand from the papers that this section of Members of

the House communicated with my right hon. Friend, and that they made a most modest request. Their request was that this matter of the Eight Hours Bill should have the attention which it merited in the course of the Debate, and I suppose they meant in the course of the speech of my right hon. Friend. Has it had the attention which it merits? Has it had one single word from my right hon. Friend? Has the subject been mentioned in the whole course of the Debate except by the hon. Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt)—who is opposed to the Eight Hours Bill—and by myself? And yet, in the face of this putting aside of the modest request of the miners' Representatives, there is not a Representative of a miners' constituency, or a Representative of labour in this House, who is able or willing to get up and express his opinion of the situation. Well, Sir, I have heard a good deal of the Independent Labour Party. I shall believe in it when I see it. I shall not say a word about the other sections of the majority, of the Crofters' Members, of the Scotch Home Rulers, the London Metropolitan Members who favour the London programme, or even of the other Members who are the friends and supporters of the United Kingdom Alliance. I say not one word of them, because I understand that they have been in some way or another reconciled and squared, and, so far as they are concerned, my argument would be out of place. They will form part of the great homogeneous Party which is to be formed and is to be the "nebular hypothesis" of which we have heard. I have spoken only of the British part of the majority which is to defeat the Government to-night. You can, perhaps, dispose of the difficulties arising out of English, Scotch, and Welsh questions. Can you dispose of the Irish difficulty? And now I appeal to every man of sense and intelligence. Is it not entering on a fool's paradise to attempt to form a Government until, at least, you have assured yourselves that you have a sufficient agreement on the main points of the Irish Question to be able to go on with a sufficient majority? Now, Sir, is there any certainty about

*Mr Joseph Chamberlain*

that? I should like to ask a question. Are all the majority Home Rulers? I know they are classed as such, but we have seen in the Press that a certain section of them have been recommending that Home Rule should be postponed and that other British measures should take its place. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), I am told, has been endeavouring to persuade the Irish Members that it would be to their distinct advantage that such questions as Welsh Disestablishment, One Man One Vote, and Registration should be dealt with in the course of the next two or three Sessions, and that thereby they should obtain a leverage whereby Home Rule might be secured. The hon. Member for Northampton appears to me a good deal sobered by the visions of coming responsibility. I do not wonder at his silence; he thinks the more. He has, indeed, a difficult task. It is said that he will have high office in the "nebular hypothesis." He will then have to reconcile the interests of the Cabinet with the interests of *Truth*. Now, Sir, how do the Irish Members like the idea of having in the centre of this Government a hon. Member—a right hon. Member I suppose he will be then—who is determined to do his best to slip off the yoke of Home Rule in order to introduce British reforms? The hon. Member for Waterford quoted, with apparent pleasure, a speech of my right hon. Friend in which he had referred to the Irish Question as the "Old Man of the Sea." But does the hon. Member remember his *Arabian Nights*? Does he remember what became of that Old Man of the Sea? Sinbad made him drunk, and then Sinbad broke his head with a stone. Are they certain that this sad fate may not befall them at the hands of the hon. Member for Northampton? If the hon. Member for Northampton takes that line he will have support in the new Cabinet—he will have the support of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Bridgeton Division (Sir George Trevelyan). The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Bridgeton Division, I am sure, will forgive me for reminding him that he said in this House that—

"The confession that the Liberal Party was a Home Rule Party—I speak with all respect for those who think otherwise—is one to which, until every faculty I have is strained to the uttermost, and every Constitutional method, inside and outside the House, has been exhausted, I, for one, will never consent."

I should not think of doing the injustice to the right hon. Gentleman of supposing that he would be false to a pledge so complete, so emphatic, and so strong as that which I have just read to the House. Again, I ask hon. Members from Ireland how they like the prospect with two Cabinet Ministers in the citadel, both of them determined, to their utmost, to prevent the Liberal Party being a Home Rule Party, from being confined to the prosecution of a Home Rule measure? But, putting that aside, and assuming that in some way or another these difficulties are got over—though I should not like to assume that they had been got over by the exclusion of the hon. Member for Northampton or the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Bridgeton Division from the next Cabinet—but assuming that they have been got over, then, I ask, what kind of Home Rulers are the majority of this House? Are they Federal Home Rulers, or Colonial Home Rulers, or Gladstonian Home Rulers, or Parnellite Home Rulers, or Gas and Water Home Rulers? Of course, it would be perfectly absurd, with the time at my disposal, that I should deal with all the questions—the important questions—which arise in connection with this subject of Home Rule, and as to which there is a difference of opinion. But I am going to beg the attention of the House to one, and one only. I am going to ask them to consider how far the majority of the House are united and agreed to such an extent as to afford the slightest justification for their taking Office and holding Office for five months without appealing to the House of Commons. I am going to ask how far they are united upon this one question. It is a question of the supremest importance, as every hon. Member, I am sure, will admit. It is a question to which my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian has pointed again and again, and has said in this House that when any proposal was

made for the better government of Ireland the first thing which it behoved the Members of the House of Commons to do was to inquire how far and in what way the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament might be preserved. Now, Sir, are the majority agreed in regard to this question of supreme importance, which was made of supreme importance at the Election? Are they agreed as to the methods by which they will secure this supremacy, and as to the kind of supremacy which they will give? Now, I assert that in regard to this question, my right hon. Friend—and not only he but every important Leader of the Liberal Party—has declared emphatically and distinctly in favour of a supremacy of the Imperial Parliament which shall be absolute, which shall be unquestioned, which shall be continuous, which shall be effective and practicable. Now, the House will see the importance of this. We have often complained—I have complained to my right hon. Friend in regard to certain parts of the Home Rule Bill. He left us in the dark, and we could not gather from his language what it was that he would propose. But I should be doing him scant justice if I did not say that in regard to this matter his language has been as plain and distinct as man can wish. Now, I am sorry I have to delay the House by quotations which are always tedious; but I really feel that this question, lying as it does at the root of this Home Rule controversy, might be settled once for all, and that before we separate for five months we ought at least to know what will be the policy of any Government of which my right hon. Friend shall be the head, and how far that is a policy which the majority can unanimously support. Now, I have said that I think it is important to show that not only my right hon. Friend, but all the Leaders of the Party, are agreed upon this point. My hon. and learned Friend the Member for Hackney (Sir Charles Russell), speaking only a month ago at Richmond—8th July, 1892—said—

"What would be the checks upon this Parliament? First, the veto of the Crown in cases of importance or grave impolicy; secondly, the fact that as the Imperial Parliament had made this other, so it could unmake

or modify it; and, thirdly, the inherent right of the Imperial Parliament to legislate directly for any portion of the Queen's Empire. It was not contemplated that any of these checks should be used except in the case of dire necessity. But he wished to point out the enormous reserve force which would still remain with the Imperial Parliament."

Now I want to point out that I attach great importance to this statement, because it comes from my hon. and learned Friend, who is not only an Irishman, and therefore intimately acquainted with all the details of this controversy, but who is a lawyer, and knows exactly the meaning of Constitutional legal language. But it appears from his statement that the Imperial Parliament will have, as a reserve force, in the first place, the veto of the Crown, which will be—must be—exercised by a British Minister; otherwise it would not belong to the Imperial Parliament. And, secondly, it will have the inherent concurrent right of legislation in case of dire necessity on matters committed to the Irish Parliament. Well, then I go on to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Bridgeton Division (Sir George Trevelyan). The right hon. Gentleman says—

"If the Imperial Parliament does not continue Imperial I shall never care to sit in it again. By Imperial Parliament I mean, and we all mean, a Parliament which represents in equal proportions all parts of the United Kingdom. We mean a Parliament that is not only nominal or theoretical, but also real, practical, and genuine, controlling every other body and authority whatsoever—a Parliament to which every citizen may look for the safety of his life, and for the maintenance of his personal rights."

Therefore I know so long as the right hon. Gentleman sits in this Parliament, every man, every Irishman, may continue to look to him for the safety of his life and the maintenance of his personal rights. Now I come to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt). He says, 17th April, 1891—

"The principle for which the Liberal Party has contended has been the right of the Irish people to manage their own affairs, always subject to the control of the Imperial Parliament."

The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that Mr. Parnell had once accepted that principle, but that now he re-

pudiated it, and that the principle for which Mr. Parnell now contended was one which the Liberal Party had never countenanced, and one which they should never support. Well, I think that hitherto it must have been perfectly clear to the House that these statements exactly fulfil the account I gave of them; that they are consistent with one another; that they all point to the same kind of supremacy, exercised in the same way. Now I come to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley). Speaking 6th July, 1887, at Manchester, and referring to something which Lord Hartington had said, he says—

"But does Lord Hartington mean—I hope this may be the case—that if the Parliament at Dublin passed unjust, tyrannical, vindictive, oppressive measures, against any section of the Irish population, the Parliament of Westminster shall be free promptly, by some means or other, direct or indirect, to overrule and so forbid such a law? If this is what Lord Hartington means, there is no difference of opinion and no difference of aim. I hope we shall not interfere to prevent mere unwisdom and mere mistakes; for the mischief has come because Ireland has not had the responsibility of her own acts. We should not interfere to prevent mere unwisdom; but we should interfere, I suppose, and I hope, to prevent injustice and wrong."

Well, but coming down much later, in July, 1892, the right hon. Gentleman, referring again to this matter, said that whenever the Irish Parliament did anything that was violently wrong and violently oppressive the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament would come into force. Well, now, who is to decide what is violently oppressive? It must be the British House of Commons. Nobody else can. Consequently this follows from what the right hon. Gentleman has said—that if in a Parliament, after Home Rule has been granted, with the retention of the Irish Members at Westminster, if any Representative of Ulster, for instance, should think that any act of the Irish Parliament was oppressive and wrong he would be able to bring it before this House; and if he could convince this House of that fact this House would overrule it. The right hon. Gentleman does not believe that the Irish Parliament will ever do anything violently oppressive or violently wrong. We cannot take so

*Mr. Joseph Chamberlain*

hopeful a view of the situation when we have before us the threats which have been made again and again by those who would control an Irish Parliament, and who have said, in effect, that they will have their revenge upon their enemies by its means. If they were to try to do what they have threatened to do, then it would be a bounden and clear duty of this House to step in and to prevent, either by concurrent legislation or by the veto of the Crown, such an act of wrongful and violent oppression. Well, I have, I think, dealt with the declarations of most of the Leaders who sit on this Bench, and I have left to the last my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) who, no doubt, could control them all. What does my right hon. Friend himself say upon this subject? He was speaking at Nottingham on the 19th October, 1887. On the previous day he had referred to the matter, and said that—

"The Irish Parliament must be subject to the Imperial Parliament and liable"—these are the words of the right hon. Gentleman—"if need be, to be corrected by it."

How can one Parliament be corrected by another without constant supervision and control? Every act, every deed, of an Irish Parliament will have to be controlled and supervised by the Imperial Parliament. But on the next day he returned again to the subject, and explained himself more fully. He said in answer to an objection which had been taken—

"Will not the Crown, in a system of Home Government in Ireland, be the Lord Lieutenant? Will not the appointment of the Lord Lieutenant, who must be the head of the Irish Executive, effectually afford to the British Crown, and through the British Crown to the British Ministry, and through the British Ministry to the British Parliament, the power of interfering, of which I can only say that I am certain of its sufficiency for any purpose whatever? And I devoutly hope and pray it may never be used in the wantonness of tyrannical strength for the purpose of evil and mischief. But if an Irishman challenges me on that subject, and complains that this power of Parliament to decide the settlement would exist, I must own to you that my only answer would be, 'Trust in the magnanimity of the British nation and their Representatives, and rely upon it that they will not seek to defeat by unjust interference the spirit of the settlement.'"

Now, it appears that the British Parliament, through the British Ministers

and through the British Crown, is to have a power of interference which my right hon. Friend says is sufficient for any purpose whatsoever. He says it may be used for the purpose of evil and mischief; but even then the power does not cease. He can only hope that it will not be used in the tyrannical wantonness of overpowering strength; and if the Irish complain that under these circumstances their Parliament is really subject to the control of the Parliament at Westminster, my right hon. Friend says, "Trust to the magnanimity of the British nation." That was in 1887. Has my right hon. Friend altered his mind since then? I am able to say that he has not. During this last Election Mr. Oscar Browning was a candidate for East Worcester—he was referred to by the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond) the other night. Mr. Browning said that any Bill passed by an Irish Parliament would be subject to the veto of the Queen through the advice of Her English Ministers. The accuracy of that statement, as being the view of the Gladstonian Party, was questioned in the Press. There was a letter written to my right hon. Friend, and he replied—26th May, 1892—

"Thomas Harris, Esq., Birmingham,—Mr. Browning's account of the veto, if I understand it correctly, is right, and the opposite contention is absurd."

The "opposite contention" was that the veto would be exercised on the advice of the Irish Ministers. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think, at all events, that I have proved what I undertook to prove as to the clearness of view with which this question of supremacy has always been dealt with, both by my right hon. Friend and by the other Leaders of the Liberal Party. It was on this view of the question that the Election was fought, and it is this view of the question that you are going to confirm by your vote to-night, if you mean that vote to imply confidence in my right hon. Friend. Now, what do the Irish Nationalist Party say to this state of things? I was going to have quoted the opinion of the hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. William O'Brien), the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. John Dillon), the hon. Member for North Louth (Mr. Timothy Healy), the hon.

Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), and other hon. Members belonging to that section of the Party, to show that they had always demanded in the strongest possible terms that the Irish Parliament should be absolutely supreme in regard to the affairs committed to it. But this is unnecessary, from a correspondence which the hon. Member for Cork City had with me, and which, after, I suppose, his characteristic fashion, he sent to the Press without my permission, and without waiting for any reply which I might have wished to make to his last letter. In the correspondence there is evidence of a desire on the part of the hon. Member for Cork City to whittle away his previous declaration; and, so far as he is concerned, I think it is quite likely, if he dared, he would range himself side by side with the Party above the Gangway, and would be whipped as easily as any of them. But, fortunately, I need not trouble the House with quotations from these hon. Members, because the House heard the appeal made to them by the hon. Member for Waterford. I imagine there is no love lost between the two sections of the Irish Nationalist Party. If they could, the larger section would be glad enough to contradict the smaller; but when the hon. Member for Waterford declared what, in his opinion, was the irreducible minimum of the majority of the Irish people, and challenged those around him to get up and say that any one of them would take one whit less, they all remained silent; and until, therefore, any such contradiction of the hon. Member for Waterford is forthcoming, we must take it for granted that he did accurately represent the views of the whole Irish Nationalist Party upon this point. Now what did he say?

An hon. MEMBER: That is a large assumption.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: A large assumption! Let some Member of the Irish Nationalist Party get up—

MR. TIMOTHY HEALY (Louth, N.): We will allow neither him nor you to boss us.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: What was the hon. Member for Waterford's demand? It was that the supremacy

of the Irish Parliament in regard to Irish affairs should be absolute, and that in regard to those affairs which are committed to them there should be no interference from this country. And, above all, that there should be no English veto, and that the only veto which should be permitted was a veto upon the advice of the Irish Ministers. And he went on to say that the matters which were to be committed to the Irish Parliament are to include the land, the police, and the judiciary, which are precisely the things about which most likely a controversy would arise between the British and the Irish Parliaments. Now, do my hon. Friends behind me see why my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian passed by without the slightest allusion to the speech of the hon. Member for Waterford? If he had spoken about it, what could have he said? He could only have said—"What you ask for I refuse; what you demand you shall not have. I have declared—I am pledged by everything that can pledge an honourable man, by a declaration made so recently as May of the present year—I am pledged to refuse the demand which you make upon me." My right hon. Friend has thought it better to postpone the question. Meanwhile there will be six months of a Government which will insure the hostility of the Irish Nationalist Party if it keep faith with England. Well, Sir, I began by saying that the singularity of all this Debate is that we do not know when we have thrown this Government out whether the next Government, or whether any possible Government, can command a majority of this House. And yet we are to be prorogued and have no opportunity of pronouncing an opinion upon the incoming Government. The incoming Government, if it does not settle this matter of the supremacy of Parliament with its Irish allies, and if they stick to what they said—though it may be all "nebulous hypothesis"—but if these promises are kept, the incoming Government will not be in a majority of forty, but will be in a minority of 120. Then we shall be beginning the state of things which was contemplated with so much glee by one hon. Irish Member when he said that they would knock

*Mr. Joseph Chamberlain*

out one Government after another and would force us to take a Dissolution once in six months. Mr. Speaker, we may then have to ask the question—How is the Queen's Government to be carried on? The noble Lord the Member for the Barnsley Division (Earl Compton) told me on Tuesday night that, say what I might, they had all made up their minds—that no argument would win a vote from them. Yes; I believe that is true. I do not think, however, that it is a compliment to my hon. Friend to say that they are impervious to argument and impatient of debate. But at least, although I cannot win a vote from them, I may ask them how long is this serious state of things to continue? How long are you going to allow ducks and drakes to be made by the Irish Party of all your British legislation. Is it not a serious situation? My right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian, in 1885, gave a very grave and serious warning to the Liberal Party. He warned them that it would be dangerous to them, and dangerous to the Empire, if they proceeded to the consideration of this question of the government of Ireland as long as there was a Party in the House which could say to them—"Unless you do this or unless you do that we will turn you out to-morrow." Well, Sir, what has happened since that has lessened in the slightest degree the value or the weight of the advice that was then given to the Liberal Party? Why is it safe to do now what it would not have been safe to do then? The task that you have undertaken is a gigantic task—it is a herculean labour. You are not going easily to pull to pieces and to reconstruct a Constitution. Even as you are, in the last Election you failed. By an overwhelming majority the people of England are against you, and you know, if it had been possible to confine the issue to Home Rule, that the decision would have been still more against you. There are two conditions which are essential, and you know it, to the prosecution of your great design. One is that you should be absolutely agreed among yourselves. The other is that you should be able to look to, to count upon, a spirit of moderation and conciliation from your allies, pushed

even to the furthest conclusion. You have neither. You know that on many important questions there are serious differences among you, and you know that those whom you seek to benefit are even now professing the arrogant intention of dictating to you even the details of the measure. I say, then, it may be true that I cannot win a vote; but at least I can ask the wisest and most sensible among you—(Derisive laughter below the Gangway,—yes; to the others I do not speak, to re-consider the position. What was at all times supremely difficult has now become, in the present circumstances, impossible; and though it would be too much to ask from you, after having been for six years struggling in the fight, sufficient self-denial to resist the temptation to grasp at the fruits of victory—aye, and the semblance of power, yet you cannot conceal from yourselves that you will be unable to gratify the expectations which you have excited, and that your efforts are doomed beforehand to inevitable failure.

(5.35.) MR. W. G. E. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I have no doubt it may be the policy of hon. Members opposite to attempt to stifle debate, but I see so many right hon. Gentlemen above the Gangway, and there are probably many other hon. Members in the House, who must feel that the issues raised upon this occasion are a sufficient apology for an hon. Member in the same position as myself to intervene for a few minutes in this discussion. On Tuesday evening the hon. Member for North Louth (Mr. Timothy Healy) made a complaint as to the continuance of this Debate. I believe there are very few Members who would agree with him in that complaint. He complained of the repetition of well-worn arguments. It is entirely owing to the action of the hon. Member and of his friends that we have learned of recent years to consider the repetition of well-worn argument as one of his well-known privileges. It is a singular and significant symptom of the suspicion permeating the ranks of hon. Members opposite that the hon. Member for East Clare (Mr. William Redmond), yearning to discover some political idol on the Front Opposition Bench



to whom he might with confidence offer his fidelity, was obliged to be content with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley). I congratulate that right hon. Gentleman on his new-found supporter, because he has already fallen under the suspicion of his own political friends. It is not very long ago that the hon. and learned Member for North-West Durham (Mr. Atherley-Jones) described him as one of those official Liberals who are completely out of touch with the rank and file of his Party; and he has also been described by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) as "a political visionary." But now, I presume, the right hon. Gentleman, confident with the support so spontaneously offered to him by the hon. Member for East Clare, will feel himself in a position to regard with equal contempt the criticism of the hon. Member for North-West Durham and the gibes of the hon. Member for Northampton. But, Sir, I also presume that the political friendship which has been offered to the right hon. Gentleman by the hon. Member for East Clare will not be the less agreeable to him on account of the aroma of Paganism with which it is impregnated, or on account of his having been described by the organ of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland as "an agent of Satan." But the hon. Member for Clare was not content with offering his friendship to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle. He proceeded to offer to my hon. Friends who represent Unionist opinion in Ireland certain guarantees for the safeguarding of the civil and religious liberty of the populations they represent. I hope I may be pardoned if I venture to cast a shadow of suspicion on the value of that offer. It would have had more commercial value, to my mind, if the fate of the hon. Member's friends had been less disastrous in their recent experiences. In the late Parliament they numbered some thirty strong. They went into the General Election with full and confident hopes. They raised in Ireland the standard of independence of political action, and they attempted to prescribe to the Bishops of their Church the due limits of

spiritual authority and of political action? How has this action been described? I hope the House will pardon me for one moment in drawing attention to a very remarkable extract from a leading article in the *Irish Catholic* of the 30th July. This paper is the recognised organ of the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops, and how does it describe the political action of the hon. Member for Clare and his friends? Speaking of a declaration made by the Roman Catholic Primate of Ireland, the leading article says this—

"Wisely and righteously, therefore, does Dr. Logue warn the Catholics of Ireland that false prophets have come amongst them; for never were the agents of Satan more busy than they are to-day, and never were more persistent or more strenuous efforts being made to impair the religious fervour of our people, to lessen their loyalty and obedience to the Church . . . . The spirit of irreligion is abroad in our midst, and impious men . . . . have set themselves to work to destroy the ancient and traditional loyalty and submission of our race to Christian principles and to the dictates of Catholic discipline."

Then the article goes on to say—

"What has been witnessed, and what is still being witnessed, is the working out of an organised conspiracy, having for its object the inculcation of the theory, and the establishment and acceptance in Ireland of the principle, that religion shall have naught to do with politics—a conspiracy which aims at proclaiming to our prelates and clergy that their right to admonish and instruct their flocks is held only by the frail tenure of mob approval, a conspiracy which would poison the fountains of public conscience and make public opinion merely the index and record of the machinations of secret societies and occult caucuses."

What has been the result of the action of the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond) and his friends? As I have said, they were in the last Parliament thirty strong. They are only nine in this; so that the offer made by the hon. Member for East Clare is absolutely ridiculous, altogether unworthy of consideration; and I can only express a hope that the political friendship he has offered to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle has more substantial security behind it. The hon. and learned Gentleman who moved the Amendment to the Address (Mr. Asquith) alluded to the representation from Ireland, and he asked where, outside the Pro-

Mr. W. G. E. Macartney

vince of Ulster, and outside the City of Dublin, in Ireland could the Government show a freely elected Representative prepared to support them? I admit the Government cannot do that; but I say that the Government can do something which the Front Opposition Bench cannot do. Her Majesty's Government can point to a number of freely-elected Representatives of Ireland, not confined to one Province, who come here to support them, not for one Division only, but for the whole life of this Parliament. They do so, because these Representatives are not suspicious of the policy of the Government, nor of the sincerity of the Leaders of that policy. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian could not do that. Neither he, nor any of his colleagues on that Bench, can point to a single Representative elected to support their peculiar views in Ireland. Every single politician professing the nebulous doctrines of pure Gladstonianism received an ignominious defeat; and the only supporters of the right hon. Gentleman are the band of mercenary politicians for whose support in every engagement in this House he must pay. I quite admit that the Unionist Members are not the only freely-elected Members from Ireland in this House. There are nine others; but the seventy who follow, I will not say the leadership, because the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy) is merely the bell-wether of the flock—who have to obey the dictation of Archbishop Walsh—those seventy are nothing more or less than political pawns, whose existence in this House depends not so much on the will of the constituencies as upon the approval of their spiritual autocrats. Now, the probable exercise of ecclesiastical tyranny and dictation at the General Election was foreseen some time ago. An old Member of this House, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, in the year 1891, declared that

"to his mind the real danger that presented itself in Ireland was the fact that the priests of the country would make an unfair use of their power at the Election, and that he had no doubt that the General Election would be carried by that means; but the question which lay before him, and lay before other politicians

in Ireland, was the question whether the country was to be clerically governed or not, and the sooner that was to be decided the better."

I desire in a few words to point out to the House how the anticipations of Mr. Patrick O'Brien have been realised, and I will read a short extract from a speech made by a defeated Parnellite candidate on the 12th July of this year. Mr. Kettle, speaking, I think, at a meeting of the Irish National League, said this—

"The effect of the action taken by the Bishops and priests of Ireland during the Election rendered Home Rule in the immediate future a matter of impossibility. In his opinion"—

I should like to draw the attention of hon. Members sitting on the opposite Benches to this—

"it would be greatest lunacy to imagine that Protestant England would delegate for a moment the government of the country into the hands of a Clerical Party."

And then he went on to speak of some of the more distinguished Members of the Party who are guided by the Council of Seven—

"He knew that Messrs. Davitt, John Dillon, William O'Brien, and Tim Healy were four of the most anti-clerical politicians in Ireland; and where were they now? In the position of the most degraded political hypocrites under the sun, under the feet of the clergy, working out their political ambitions through the agency of the men who two or three years ago they would not touch."

The hon. Member for North Louth (Mr. Timothy Healy) said he would not be bossed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) nor by the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond); but he and all his political friends are bossed not by a political Leader, but by Archbishop Walsh. If there is one thing more astonishing than another in this Debate, it is the remarkable silence that exists among hon. Gentlemen from Ireland below the Gangway opposite. There are some hours yet before a Division can take place, and if they agree to send a telegram to Drumcondra Palace they might get permission to join in this Debate. I think it would throw a very strong light on the speeches made by Members both above and below the Gangway. The opinion

which has been expressed by Mr. Kettle, and which I have just read, can be reproduced from almost every Division in which there was a contest in the South and West of Ireland. I think that it was in East Limerick that the chairman of a meeting which was held in support of one of the followers of the hon. Member for Waterford declared—

"The constitution of the political life of the country was taken out of the hands of the people by the Catholic Church, and the men who were determined to do their best on behalf of Ireland were overruled by the Church, whose nominees were carefully chosen, not for the purpose of doing justice to Ireland, but for the purpose of keeping Ireland in slavery."

It would be an easy matter for me to quote from the speech of almost every defeated candidate of Nationalist views in Ireland. The hon. Member who now sits for some Division in Donegal, I forget which—nothing is more remarkable in the political career of hon. Members from Ireland than the nomadic character of their representation—if he disagrees with these quotations he has now an ample opportunity of assuring the House and the country that the charges, many of which I understand will be substantiated in Courts of Law against his Party, are untrue by disproving them. But I would draw the attention of hon. Members belonging to the English section of the Liberal Party to the fact that it is because a large number of Members were elected in Ireland by means of intimidation of the grossest character, carried on under ecclesiastical auspices, that they, who claim now to be the apostolic successors of a great Party whose cry was once "civil and religious liberty," are able to turn out the present Government to place themselves on this side of the House. I fancy that they will find before the end of this Parliament that the price which they are going to pay for this support will be a very expensive one to them. We know that that support is to be purchased. The negotiations have gone on in the face of hon. Members of this House. The seventy-one Members who follow the Leadership of the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy) are going to walk into the Lobby with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian;

*Mr. W. G. E. Macartney*

and the hon. Member for North Longford has asked for payment. He will take part of it in cash, and he is good enough to say he will take the rest in a bill for six months. What is the cash payment? It is to consist of an inquiry into the case of the evicted tenants and the release of the dynamite prisoners. But there was also a most remarkable expression of hope with regard to the administration of the government of Ireland—namely, that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian should give some assurance that the administration of Ireland will be carried on in accordance with the expression of public opinion in that country. I should like to know what interpretation the hon. Member for North Longford and his Party place upon that form of words, and what interpretation the right hon. Member for Midlothian and his colleagues, who are going to undertake the administration of Ireland, place upon that assurance which he is asked to give? What is the public opinion in Ireland under which the administration of that country is to be carried on; to what sort of expression is it to be obedient, and to what sort is it to be deaf? We know that in Ireland public opinion finds vent in many ways. Is the Plan of Campaign, and are the doctrines of those who promoted it, to find ready acceptance by those who are to be charged with the administration, during the next six months, of law and justice in Ireland? Is the future Chief Secretary to bear in mind that in every part of the country he is to allow the machinery of law to remain paralysed when it comes into conflict with the expressions of the hon. Member who represents Mayo? It is only the other day that a most remarkable expression was attributed to one Irish Member by the public Press. It is reported that he said he was looking to the time when he could wade through Protestant blood in Ireland.

MR. SWIFT MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): Who said that?

MR. MACARTNEY: The expression was attributed to the hon. Member for, I think, the St. Patrick's Division of Dublin.

MR. MAC NEILL: Will the hon. Member repeat that statement when the hon. Member is present?

MR. MACARTNEY: I shall be very glad to repeat it. I regret that the hon. Member is not in the House now. ("Oh!") But I will give the hon. Member every opportunity of denying whether or not he said so. I hope he will be able to say that what was attributed to him is a mistake; but I want to know whether that is the sort of expression of public opinion to which the hon. Member below the Gangway opposite, and the right hon. Gentleman above, believe that they will have to assimilate and to attune the administration of the country? This is a matter of the highest importance, not only to the population which I represent, and to the people of Ulster, but to the population which finds no direct representation in this House, and must trust to the efforts which we can make on their behalf. If the assurance which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian is going to give in order to purchase the support of hon. Members below the Gangway is an assurance which is to deprive the loyal population of the South and West of Ireland of that provision which they have enjoyed under the laws of this country for the last six years, then the right hon. Gentleman ought to tell this House and the country that distinctly before the Division is taken and we separate. We will dare to say that if this had been one of the issues that had been submitted to the country, and upon which, in the words of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife, an unambiguous verdict of the electors had been given, the result would have been very different. Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to say that, if he had answered the question put to him by the hon. Member for North Longford before the General Election, he would have had behind him in the House a majority that would have enabled him to sit on this side of the House? I doubt very much whether any great portion of the United Kingdom electors would have voted in favour of the Members who will follow the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian this evening into the Lobby if they

had for one moment conceived that one of their first duties would be to give an assurance to their Irish masters below the Gangway, and that even before Parliament had time to assemble, and before they had opportunity of placing on the Table of this House their Home Rule Bill, they would be asked to upset the functions of law and order in Ireland, and practically declare through their Leader that "the game of law and order was up" in this country. I repeat that the House and the people of Ireland are entitled to a distinct assurance from the right hon. Gentleman and from his friends as to the course they intend to pursue. I observe that when it came to the question of the dynamitards, the right hon. Gentleman was careful to read from a document which he produced in this House. It would have been quite simple for him to give an answer in the negative or affirmative. The question of the release of these prisoners has been considered over and over again, and in previous debates the right hon. Gentleman distinctly stated by his own Home Secretary, the right hon. Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), that these prisoners were rightly convicted, and that they were guilty of the most heinous offence, and that he could see no reason whatever for interfering with the term to which they were sentenced. I should like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman gave so ambiguous an answer on Tuesday night in order that the moment the Members of this House are dispersed, and the House is prorogued, he may immediately make cash payment to the hon. Member for North Longford by the release of these men, who were found guilty of one of the worst crimes that ever disgraced civilisation. The Mover of the Amendment declared that in his opinion it was not necessary to give any reasons in support of it—that reasons were irrelevant to the issue, and that the only issue really relevant was to count votes. He quoted the authority of Mr. Disraeli in 1859. There was another thing that Mr. Disraeli stated in that Debate, and which has escaped the notice of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife. Mr. Disraeli said that the noble Lord who had moved the Amendment

to the Address on that occasion, no doubt acting on the best advice, had really opened up all the grounds upon which such an Amendment should have been moved. But is that the case on the present occasion? The position of hon. Members opposite is this: that by hook or by crook, by placing one policy before one set and another policy before another set of constituents, they have secured a certain majority, and that the Government, without protest or without attempting to show the discordant elements of that majority, is to resign Office. I say that a public service has been done to the country by the continuance of this Debate; and, although hon. Members opposite may go into the Lobby and may secure a majority for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, they must recollect that it will have been obtained without reasons having been given, which, in the words of Mr. Disraeli, will have any moral weight in the country.

\*(6.3.) **SIR JOHN LUBBOCK** (London University): I am not surprised that an attempt should have been made to prevent my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham from taking part in this Debate; but I am surprised that the admirable speech which he delivered should have been allowed to pass without answer. No doubt, however, right hon. and hon. Members on this side of the House would have found it very difficult to answer. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian spoke in terms of high praise of the speech in which the Amendment was moved. The hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) always speaks with eloquence and ability, but I am unable to agree that his speech left nothing to be added. During the twenty or more years that I have had the honour of a seat in the House, I have never heard so important a Resolution based on such slender grounds. My hon. Friend the Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt), in seconding the Amendment, spoke as he always does, with fairness and moderation. He admitted that the present Government has done much for the working classes, and he mainly based his action, not on the past, but

on the future. Surely he must, however, see that the practical effect of his action will be to sacrifice or, at least, postpone indefinitely the very objects he has at heart. Since the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian the only one of his supporters who has addressed the House is the hon. Member for Central Finsbury (Mr. D. Naoroji), whom, on behalf of myself, and of many other Members, I welcome to the House. He did not, however, profess to give any reasons in support of the Amendment before the House. The object of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition in deprecating any discussion was not merely the fear of what his opponents may say, but also, and perhaps almost more, the dread of what might be said by his supporters. Already there are ominous mutterings, and questions have been put which it has not been convenient to answer. The House has heard a very important speech from the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond). In this instance he told us that he spoke, not only for his own Party, but for Irish Nationalists generally. The hon. Member spoke of Ireland as if it were in a position of political inferiority, forgetting that Ireland has a larger number of Members in the House than she can fairly claim, either by population or in relation to her contribution to the Imperial Exchequer. He referred to Hottentots, but Hottentots do not send Members to Parliament. Having complained of the inferior position of Ireland, the hon. Member went on to maintain that Irish Members were masters of the situation. But, if so, what becomes of his complaint? If the Irish Members are, as they say, masters of the situation, they can secure any reasonable legislation for Ireland without a Home Rule Bill. Have they not, in fact, done so to a great extent during recent years? After the experience of the last Election, after what has been heard in the Debate, the Irish people may find that they are imposing upon themselves a heavy yoke—a yoke none the lighter because it is spiritual. It is all very well to laugh at the people of Ulster, but they will be found to be thoroughly in earnest. A Home Rule Bill then, far from settling the Irish Question, will

*Mr. W. G. E. Macartney*

only raise it in a more difficult form. We must, however, look at the question, not merely from the Irish, but from the English point of view also. We are, indeed, too much disposed to look upon Home Rule as an Irish question. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House said truly that if the partnership between England and Ireland is to be dissolved, the English are entitled to a voice as to the terms of that dissolution. The case is, however, even stronger, for not only is the present partnership to be dissolved, but a new one is to be constituted upon terms to be dictated by the Irish Nationalists. This is, therefore, not simply an Irish question—it is a vital English question. The first demand of the hon. Member for Waterford was the recognition of the Irish people as a separate nation. Yet Home Rulers complain when the term "Separatists" is applied to them. Then the hon. Member proceeded to claim for the proposed Irish Parliament "full, free, and unfettered control over Irish affairs." If Irish Members are to regulate all Irish affairs at home, and then are to come over and vote upon English and Imperial matters, they will be, in the words of the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Bridgeton Division of Glasgow (Sir George Trevelyan), not only their own masters in Dublin, but masters here as well. The hon. Member for Waterford compared England to Sinbad in the Oriental tale; but when the Old Man threw Sinbad down, he fell too, and his triumph was only temporary. Under the arrangement now proposed, however, we, in Great Britain, shall be at the mercy of the Irish Members, who will vote on Imperial affairs without responsibility, inasmuch as the consequences will fall wholly on Great Britain, and not on Ireland at all. Neither the hon. Member for Longford, nor the hon. Member for Waterford entered into the question of finance. I wish they had done so. But they claim—and this is, I understand, proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian—that the Irish Parliament shall have full control of Irish taxation and Irish Revenues—subject only to a certain fixed contribution for the service of the Debt and for naval and military ex-

penditure. The late Mr. Parnell attached—and I believe the Irish Members attach—much importance to this, as a means of enabling them to foster and encourage Irish industries and manufactures. They must admit, however, that the industrial communities of Ireland, like those of England and Scotland, are mainly Unionist. The hon. Member for Waterford went on to say that Mr. Parnell never assented to the sum proposed to be paid by Ireland in the Home Rule Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. But suppose he had; he could not bind his successors. The question will certainly give rise to much friction between the two Islands. It will be represented as a tribute. Not merely the amount, but the very payment of the sum at all will be questioned. One object the late Mr. Parnell had in view was to foster native industries. How did he propose to effect that? By the imposition of protective duties. I am not going to argue the question of Free Trade, but I will ask English and Scotch Members to consider whether they are prepared for the establishment of artificial barriers between the commerce of the two Islands? It seems necessarily, however, to follow that there must be a separate Customs House. The duty on Irish whisky is levied in Ireland, but my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian will agree that on the whisky imported into England it is really paid by the English consumer. Unless, then, it is taxed on entry, we shall pay the duty and the Irish Parliament will spend the money. With separate Customs duties, a separate system of taxation, and separate accounts, it is idle to talk of maintaining the Union. I wish to point out to English Members how unfair, how intolerable our position will be. The Irish contribution to Imperial expenditure will be fixed, and yet Irish Members will come here and vote on Imperial policy. They may involve us in war, keep a Ministry in power against the wishes of England and Scotland, in support of a policy which England and Scotland disapprove, for which England and Scotland will have to pay, and towards which they will contribute nothing. The hon. Member for Waterford de-

posed Home Rule on the ground of the existence of crime and outrage. Now crime has ceased and outrage has diminished, they say Ireland should not have Home Rule because she is happy and contented. It really seems impossible to please our opponents. Ireland claims as her right and expects as her due what our opponents would not refuse if she were four thousand miles away. They give Home Rule to the Cape, to the further Continent of Australia, and to New Zealand; but because Ireland is our neighbour they refuse it. They will not give to a brother what they will give to a cousin. Further than this, I should like to say, as representing a constituency where the Temperance Party is very strong, I cannot trust the present Government, because I feel that their Party at the recent Election have received so much assistance from the brewer and the publican that they cannot be expected to pass any measure of temperance reform. To sum up my whole objection to the present Government, it is that they, with the best intentions, have necessarily legislated on the side of the privileged few—we want to legislate for the unprivileged many.

(6.41.) THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CLARKE, Plymouth): I am glad that an independent Member has been found on the other side to relieve himself of the obligation to silence which has been imposed upon his fellows, and to give us some kind of reason why he proposes to vote against the present Government. In the speech to which we have just listened we have gladly heard some of the arguments with regard to Home Rule which have been put forward in the country in the course of the late Election. Hon. Members will not expect us on this side of the House to discuss what the provisions of the Home Rule Bill should be if it were brought forward. It will be our business, in the Session to which we look forward with much confidence as meeting in the early part of next year, to fight against the proposal for Home Rule, and to fight against it on the grounds that we have stated again and again in the House and in the constituencies. The question of the details of the Home Rule Bill is of impor-

*Mr. W. S. Allen*

tance in this Debate, for one reason and for one reason only, and that is that until that Home Rule Bill receives some authoritative definition and explanation there is no justification for the alliance by which the present Government is to be expelled from power. It has been a matter of discussion in this Debate whether, in the Election which has just taken place, it could seriously be said that the voice of the country has been altered on the Home Rule Question. I say that in the late Election the Home Rule Question was put to the front by us, and has kept to the front, so far as I know, persistently and perseveringly, in every constituency. It was not the case with our opponents. Amongst our opponents there were three candidates who did keep the Home Rule Question steadily in the front. One of them was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian; another was a relative of the right hon. Gentleman who sits for a Division of Leeds; and the third was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle; and by steadfastly keeping the question of Home Rule to the front in their addresses and in their speeches they reduced their aggregate majority by ten thousand votes. Of this I am sure: that if the issues of the Election could have been limited to Home Rule we should have come back with a large majority, and there would have been no question of displacement or confidence before us. Of course, it is not possible that an Election should be kept entirely to one issue. Of course you must have local questions, class questions, and industrial questions, in different constituencies; but there has been in this century one special Election, which, perhaps, more than any other, was limited to one question, and that was the Election of 1886. In 1886 a definite scheme of Home Rule was put before the House, a scheme which had been constructed with great political capacity, and had been defended in this House by the most splendid Parliamentary rhetoric which this generation has listened to. That Election in 1886 was on the specific issue of Home Rule. We know how that ended, and I am confident that if ever that question is

again to be put as a single question before the constituencies of this country, the judgment of 1886 will be repeated with increased emphasis and force, and that the constituencies would make an end of any such proposition. I am not blaming hon. Members, but we know very well that other claims were put forward. It will hardly be denied that if you take the whole area of discussion, in the main the more educated constituencies were in favour of the present Government. This has not only been admitted—it was practically avowed by the right hon. Member for Midlothian in the middle of the Election, for he said that the education, the intelligence, and the political experience of the country were against him in the appeal that he had made. How was that appeal made? I have been in many constituencies while the Election was going on, and have seen the placards on the walls and seen bills handed about, I have seen the grossest misrepresentation with respect to what has taken place in Parliament, and have seen the most amazing demands, which succeeded in some cases, upon the credulity of the electors in the matter of propositions for the future. In one of the Divisions of Dorset, where the Radical candidate did not succeed, I saw Radical placards posted along all the roads—there was in those placards nothing about Ireland, except two remarkable pictures in beautiful colours, one representing an eviction, and the other giving a highly imaginative record of the incidents of Mitchelstown. One of the many bills stuck on the walls said—“If you want free land vote for Arthur Arnold,” and I believe that the agricultural labourers of that constituency were steadily persuaded by the Radical candidate and his supporters that some measure could be brought into Parliament under which land could be freely given to them. In other constituencies other questions were similarly brought forward. In Torquay I saw a Land Bill drawn very much on the lines of that placard which caused so much amusement to the hon. Member for the Scotland Division (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), putting a series of categorical questions with the answer to each, “Mr. Oscar Browning.” It contained a number of questions as to who

gave you this and who gave you that, and in each case the answer was “Gladstone.” One line read, “Who gave you free education? Gladstone,” a piece of information which would have surprised no one so much as the right hon. Gentleman himself. Another handbill represented that the Unionist Government had taken thirty-five millions of money out of the taxes of this country in order to give a Land Purchase Bill to Ireland. These misrepresentations were made all over the country, and they have produced a certain amount of political result. If these votes have been obtained on many issues and on many pretences, surely it is reasonable that before the Government gives place to those who profess to have the confidence of the country the country should have an opportunity of seeing what is the case for or against a change of Administration. A change of Administration may be a light matter to the country, but the time that has been appointed for the change involves very serious results indeed. For five or six months the country will be in the hands of those who form a new Administration without giving on the floor of this House any specific declaration as to what their policy is either at home or abroad. We saw a most singular incident this evening—an incident inconsistent with the ordinary Rules of this House. The Division was expected to-night, but an attempt was made to put an end to the Debate, which can only be accounted for by one of two reasons, the first that no one had sufficient confidence to get up and answer the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain), and the second that those who have been loudest on the platforms of the country in the denunciation of the Government have not sufficient confidence now to get up and make an assault here where it can be answered. I do not know whether other independent Members will be found to follow the example that has just been set, and give their constituents an opportunity of knowing that those who spoke so loudly on the platforms are not absolutely dumb when they are sent to the House of Commons. I venture to predict that no one who has any hope of coming into Office in the



next Government will express his opinions. It would be so easy to disqualify himself for being a Member of a Government whose policy he does not understand. But if our opponents will not attack the policy of the Government, those who have supported the Government in the past may take the opportunity of saying something for themselves. The history of a Government is a history of a large number of authorities in different parts dealing with the administration of the affairs of the country. How is it that at the end of six years, when the chosen spokesman gets up to attack the Government and suggest that it should be displaced, that he has not one syllable of censure on the conduct of the Government with regard to any department of the administration in which it has been engaged? How is it that when you are reassuring the country as to one danger which has occurred to many—the danger of changing the arrangements for the direction of foreign affairs—that the best thing you can say to the country is that you are going to have as Foreign Minister some one who agrees with Lord Salisbury? There has been no attack on any part of the Government's policy, and if we are not to be ejected from Office because there is any fault to be found with the administration, is it upon any claims that you have a better administration or a more hopeful policy that you are demanding the confidence of the House? The hon. Member who has just sat down said he would sum up in two sentences our relations with Ireland. He said we tried coercion and it was a dismal failure, and we have tried conciliation and it has been a great success. But when did the trial of coercion leave off and the trial of conciliation begin? Whose administration brought about the unsatisfactory state of Ireland which he does not deny? And who has been in Office during these six years of peace? It is because this Government has been in power administering laws which you vainly resisted that there has been in Ireland that condition of peace of which we have a right to be proud, and as to which we sincerely hope that a change of Government may not put an end to

*Sir Edward Clarke*

a satisfactory condition of things which has so long existed. When it was said that coercion was a dismal failure, let it be remembered that the Government which went out of Office in 1885 was at the time it went out producing some of the coercive legislation which it intended to enforce. I do not desire to go over the whole of the Home Rule controversy. There will be plenty of opportunities of doing that in the future, and I think, as a matter of Party policy, those who now sit on this side of the House will be well advised to keep the question of Home Rule steadily in the front. There are many constituencies in the country in which votes were cast for the Government who would not be able to count on that allegiance if they passed from Home Rule to other issues. I am glad, therefore, that the question of Home Rule is to be kept to the front; but with respect to other matters, I cannot but lament the prospect that the time of the House is to be wasted for some years in the discussion of an absolutely hopeless and impracticable proposal. I am not speaking of another place where political matters are dealt with. It is not in reliance upon any power outside the House of Commons that I look forward with confidence to the defeat of the Home Rule Bill. It is here in this House that it will be defeated; and although I believe that others in their places and spheres will do their duty in any crisis in this country, still it is within this House that I believe we shall prove the impracticability of the scheme upon the mere shadowing forth of which you are going to lead to the Lobby the majority of this House. But I will now turn from this question of Home Rule to others which appear to me to be of equal importance. I listened with much greater interest to the speech of the Seconder than to the Proposer of the Amendment to the Address, because the hon. Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt) has for many years been very prominent indeed in the discussion of labour questions in this House. We have heard a great deal in the course of the late Election about labour questions, those affecting the condition of the industrial classes, and we were told that they would be

brought promptly before the consideration of the House. I believe the hon. Member for West Ham (Mr. Keir Hardie) proposes, as an Amendment to the Address which is to be presented to Her Most Gracious Majesty, to move to add an expression of the hope that an Autumn Session will be held in order to consider questions affecting the condition of the people. Well, that is not a very practicable suggestion of the hon. Member, as he will very soon find out if he talks with half-a-dozen Members on either side of the House. But if these condition-of-the-people questions are so important that it can be suggested Parliament should be called together in September for the purpose of discussing them, why do not the Representatives of labour discuss them to-night? Why are they silent throughout this Debate, and content to write the right hon. Gentleman for Midlothian letters which receive no answer, or, at all events, are not complied with, and why have they not the manliness to stand up in their places and insist upon labour questions being attended to as well as Irish questions? Well, Sir, the hon. Member for Morpeth alluded in his speech to several questions which brought memories to one's mind as to what the history of the Liberal Party has been with respect to labour questions. Sir, the hon. Member spoke about the Employers' Liability Act; he spoke about the Conspiracy Act, and about temperance legislation. Did it not occur to him, I wonder, when he referred to these matters, how many years ago it was when he first spoke upon them in the House of Commons, and how large an opportunity his own friends have had since then of giving effect to his wishes? Sir, the Employers' Liability Bill was first proposed from the Conservative side of the House, and carried by a Liberal Government in 1880, but in a form so incomplete and unsatisfactory that I and others in the House objected to it, and desired to improve it. Ever since 1880, the faults which we then pointed out in that Bill have been grievously felt by the working men of this country. It has caused much litigation, and at a cost which has been out of all proportion to the benefits actually received by the people for

whose benefit that Bill was passed. What is the history of the Employers' Liability Bill since then? From 1880 to 1885, while the hon. Member's friends sat upon these Benches, there was no attempt to improve it. When in 1888 we produced a Bill which would have improved it most substantially—when that Bill had passed through discussion in Grand Committee of the House and many improvements had been made—it was by the Party and partizan opposition of so-called Representatives of labour in this House that the whole of our work was thrown away, and the advantages which it would have given to the working classes was denied them. Sir, there was another question of which I was reminded by the speech of the hon. Member for Morpeth, because it was in connection with a Debate in which I for the first time had the honour of addressing this House—more than twelve years ago. The hon. Member seconded a Resolution in favour of Local Option, and he spoke then in favour of that temperance legislation with which he now suggests the House should at once deal. But, Sir, what has been the history of the temperance cause since 1880? It is as much one of the betrayed causes of the Liberal Party as the cause of the working men. In the latter part of 1880 a Resolution in favour of temperance legislation was passed by a large majority, but nothing was done by the Liberal Party then in power. In 1883 another Resolution was proposed by the ardent friends of temperance, insisting on the immediate action of the Government. They got plenty of kindly words from the Leaders of their own Party, but nothing was done, and the only real attempt that has been made—although twelve years have passed since the hon. Member for Morpeth made that speech—all that has been done in the direction of temperance was done by the present Government in the year 1888, when it made proposals which, if they had been accepted, would, in the course of these four years, have done more in the direction of temperance reform than has been done in the last twelve years. Now, Sir, if the question of Ireland is so full of difficulties that hon. Members opposite have felt it desirable to keep

menacement of his speech that only three Members of the Party to which I have the honour to belong put Home Rule in the front of their programme during the late elections, and that in each case the result was a considerably reduced majority. Now, I am very glad to draw attention to the fact that if in any case Home Rule found a secondary place in the Liberal and Radical programme throughout the country, it was certainly brought well to the front by the friends of right hon. Gentlemen opposite. They plastered our walls with disfigured representations of our National Flag, and I may call the attention of the Solicitor General to the way in which his colleague, Mr. Ritchie, put the matter before my constituents.

"To vote against the Government," said the right hon. Gentleman, "means to vote for civil war, anarchy, and oppression in Ireland."

Does that not establish the fact that the question of Home Rule has been brought well to the front in every portion of the Kingdom? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for London University (Sir John Lubbock) reminded us that the population of London is equal to that of Ireland, and I believe I shall succeed in showing that upon the question of Home Rule London has spoken with no uncertain voice. In February last the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), having hurriedly returned from slaying lions in South Africa, addressed himself to dealing with some of the Liberal lions then prowling about London. The noble Lord then said that London was "the citadel, the fortress," and, he hoped, "the impregnable fortress, of the Unionist Party;" and he begged the electors of London for the sake of the Union to vote in the County Council elections then pending against the Liberal candidates. The reply of London took this form. One hundred and eight thousand electors were prepared to defend the fortress described by the noble Lord, but one hundred and forty-eight thousand voted for the demolition of that fortress. That, I think, was a significant vote. I may be told it was merely a County Council vote, but that when questions of Imperial matters were before the electors they would

show their adhesion to the Unionist Party. But in 1886 the Unionist Party carried London by 36,000 votes, and in the recent elections the majority was reduced to something like 11,000 votes. I have selected fifty-two constituencies on both occasions, and I will venture to say that had the same voting facilities been given as were given in the County Council elections that majority of 11,000 would have been wiped out, and we should have found a considerable majority in London in favour of the Liberal and Radical programme. It is not too late to remind hon. Members that right hon. Gentlemen opposite feared to admit Saturday among the possible polling days, and that in the County Council elections the principle of One Man One Vote prevailed, whereas in the Parliamentary Elections the iniquitous system of plural voting obtained. I am perfectly sure that under other conditions we should have found London on the side of Home Rule. The First Lord of the Treasury has spoken of the desire of his Party to undertake work of social and domestic legislation, and in the light of his remarks I could not but remember my experience of them as a Member of the London County Council, and of how hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite have dealt with that body in connection with social and domestic questions. No sooner was the Council created, and when it came out the wrong colour for hon. Members opposite, than they proceeded to try to starve and strangle the Council. When we applied for facilities to carry on our business we found that, though charged with the business of the Metropolis, we had but the means of Little Pedlington, and we found ourselves checked and thwarted. The Council were anxious to put forward the great question of the London water supply, and we took an early opportunity of asking the House to pass a Bill with that object; but the Government rendered us no assistance; they balked our proposal, and we were unable to carry it through. With regard to the government of water, I will now read a few words from the official Report drawn up by a Committee of the Council consisting alike of Conservative and Liberal Members—

*Mr. J. W. Benn*

"It is desirable that Londoners should understand the effect of the refusal of the Government to entertain the application of the Council. The delay in the appointment of a Select Committee, and the inability or unwillingness of the Committee to enter into the question of a new supply, has had the effect of postponing the whole question for a whole year at least—a loss of time which, having regard to the interests and rights and growing difficulties of new sources of water supply, is much to be regretted."

That is the Report of the Committee. As a matter of fact, at the time there was this endeavour to prevent the County Council bringing water to London hon. Gentlemen were wasting the time of this House in endeavouring to subsidise those who sold beer. I am amused to hear the Solicitor General posing as a temperance reformer. What would have been the result if the Government proposals with regard to beer had been carried out? In view of the subsequent decision in "*Sharp v. Wakefield*" there is no question that many millions of money would have been lost by the carrying out of those proposals. The proposal made to the London County Council to buy up beerhouses in London would have meant a treble purchase. Therefore we are to be congratulated that the proposals of the Government with regard to the public-houses of the country were not carried out. Then there is another matter which means many thousands to the ratepayers of London. By the Local Government Bill, upon which the Government pride themselves so much, the opportunity to deduct the sewer rate from the rent was lost to many thousands of persons who had previously had that opportunity. When we suggested a division of rates between owners and occupiers, we met with no assistance from the Government. On the other hand, they seemed to take some pleasure—at all events they took no trouble to remove an additional burden which their Local Government Bill had imposed upon the ratepayers of London. I should not have ventured upon these remarks if the First Lord of the Treasury had not posed as the champion of social and domestic legislation. I can only say that the proof of the pudding is in the eating. As regards the London County Council, instead of receiving assistance, we have, from the very

first, been hindered in our work for London, and I am extremely glad that London has joined in this Vote of No Confidence in the Government. Here, in the very centre of the influence of the Unionist Party, there has been no uncertain answer.

MR. E. G. VILLIERS STANLEY (Lancashire, S.E., Westhoughton): It is with the utmost diffidence that I ask for the consideration of the House to-day—a diffidence that is only overcome by the traditional good feeling of the House towards new Members—a tradition which has now had application to three generations of my family. There is not a single new Member who could fail to be impressed by the ability of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith); but if there is one thing which has more impressed us, it is that particular ability he has displayed in entirely ignoring the heart of the Amendment which he proposed. He pointed out that the Government ought to have the confidence of this House, and with that we all agree; but, at the same time, he announced that he would be able to prove that the Government which is to replace the present one would possess that confidence. I should like to know from whence it is derived—from where Her Majesty's scratch Opposition procure an inkling of confidence. Is it from the Members of this House? I do not think the questions that have been addressed by hon. Members below the Gangway to the Leader of the House indicate any overwhelming confidence. Those questions were perfectly legitimate and honest, and ought to have been answered. But they were not responded to, because they were very bitter pills to swallow. It is currently reported that right hon. Gentlemen who sit on the Front Opposition Bench have the digestions of ostriches, and I should be sorry if that were not their possession, because it will be required when next they meet Parliament. In what other quarter may we look for this confidence? Is it in the right hon. Gentleman's (Mr. W. E. Gladstone's) constituency? If the right hon. Gentleman manages his own domestic affairs he may be conversant with the phrase "a month's warning." The right hon. Gentleman has had

many dismissals on the spot; but this time, on account of age and great intellect, his constituency was prepared to concede a month's warning—a circumstance not, however, indicative of any particularly large measure of confidence. Then, did the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) find very great confidence in his constituency? I think we may safely say that it was only the unfortunate accident of there not being a second Unionist in the field that gave him the chance of listening to this Debate. Where in Ireland is confidence derived, seeing that we have been able to win five seats? It is true that the Opposition have a majority; but the time will come when they will have to prove that they possess the confidence of this House, and the occasion will be the presentation of the Home Rule Bill. One of two things they will then have to do. They will either have to disappoint their friends behind them, or they will have to disappoint their friends below the Gangway. If they disappoint the latter we know what the result will be—a Vote of Want of Confidence, for the section concerned is the tail that wags the dog. In regard to the manner of securing their majority, the hon. Member who has just sat down (Mr. Bann) told us that we always kept Home Rule in the foreground, and my answer is that if his side had done likewise there would have been no necessity for the prospective change of Benches. In England they have obtained votes by many methods, and in this connection I should like to ask the hon. Member for the Ince Division (Mr. Woods) whether he thinks, if his opponent had supported the Eight Hours Bill, he would have been in his present position? Personally, I am of the same opinion as the hon. Member for Ince; but still I think he will admit that the Eight Hours proposals and not Home Rule carried the day in the Ince Division. We have been called a beaten, captured, and conquered army. But we are not. If we were a captured army we should have to walk out without our arms and the stipulation that we fight no longer. On the contrary, we march out with all the honours of war, a compact body ready to follow our one Leader, and ready to

*Mr. E. G. Villiers Stanley*

follow him anywhere. We shall cross not only prepared to hold our ground, but prepared to make counter-attacks. I prophesy it will not be long before we again recapture the seats.

Mr. S. WOODS (Lancashire, S.W. Ince): I feel that my intervention in this Debate is justified by the challenge which has been thrown out, first by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) and afterwards by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General (Sir Edward Clarke). And as this is the first time I have risen in this House, I feel sure, like the hon. Member who has just sat down, that I shall receive the fullest indulgence of hon. Members. I listened very carefully to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. In my judgment the speech with which he favoured the House to-night was about the most illogical he ever made in his life, and in the appeal he made for the votes of the various sections on this side he seemed to be illustrating the lines—

“Will you come into my parlour?  
Said the spider to the fly.”

I do not think his appeal will have much influence on the Labour Members, because they have already been able to judge where their true interest lies. The Solicitor General threw out the challenge, What have the Labour Members to say? I rise to answer that question. What is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to do on the subject of One Man One Vote? For there is no question on which the working man thinks more. What is his Party prepared to do in the reform of the Registration Law? I hold that every third election is lost to the Progressive Party in consequence of the unfair and unequal laws with regard to registration. Then the right hon. Gentleman and his Party voted against that vital principle, the payment of Members of Parliament. Practically, a working man cannot now get into the House of Commons, and until there is payment of Members we shall never have fair representation of the working man of this country. Is the right hon. Gentleman, and the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, prepared to support a Bill for that now? There

is also the question of the returning officers' fees, and these four questions are now occupying the minds of working men more than anything else. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham was always, up to a recent date, recognised as being the most advanced Radical in the House. Is he Radical to-day? No; he has discarded all his pretensions for a Party, in order to keep it in power. In November, 1890, the late Mr. Bradlaugh brought a Motion before the House for the abolition of perpetual pensions at less than twenty-seven years' purchase. The right hon. Gentleman opposed that Motion and it was defeated, and yet eight-tenths of the working men of this country are in favour of their abolition. In March of this year there was a very important Motion affecting the Law of Combination brought forward, dealing with the amendment of the Law of Conspiracy. I regret to see that the right hon. Gentleman voted against that Amendment, which would have benefited the Trades Unions of this country. The right hon. Gentleman also voted against the abolition of plural voting. It is true that on the 23rd March last the right hon. Gentleman voted in favour of a Miners' Eight Hours Bill, although shortly before, in answer to a friend of mine, he had said that he could not see his way to support it. And when the right hon. Gentleman spoke in favour of the Bill he put in certain qualifications which he said would be necessary; but the mining population is keenly watching the Bill, and will not accept any Amendment which will impair the utility of the measure to workers in mines. As to the position of the Labour Members, it will be admitted by both sides that the working men of this country would be the last to be frightened, or challenged without rising to defend their policy. They are never ashamed of their policy, and no measures will satisfy them which will not materially improve their present position. The eight or nine millions of working men in this country are determined to have some of these unequal laws removed from the Statute Book and fairer ones put in their place. I thank the House for

so patiently listening to the remarks I have made.

(8.0.) MR. VICARY GIBBS (Herts, St. Albans): I must congratulate the Solicitor General (Sir Edward Clarke) on having drawn a Member of the Opposition—of the Labour Party, and caused him to break through the conspiracy of silence and give his views. But instead of addressing his remarks to right hon. Gentlemen opposite, who will have the opportunity of attending to them, he addressed them to the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain). The hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Benn) told us he very much desired to see Mr. Ritchie back in the House. I am sure, after the lecture he gave us, we shall all cordially join in wishing it, and I may say that, perhaps, I have given more proof than he has of the sincerity of my desire. There was one passage in the speech of the right hon. Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) which secured the applause and the approval of every Member of the House, that was when he said we were discussing we know not what. Hon. Gentlemen opposite cheered because they were anxious to show that Her Majesty's Ministers had acted wrongly in giving the nation an opportunity of seeing by what small arguments the big battalions are supported—that they rule on the argument of force, and not on the force of argument. Doubtless the hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) was all through his speech speaking strictly to his brief, but there was one occasion when he felt that he could allow himself a safe lash out at a noble, though moribund, animal, the Liberal Unionist Party. As to the ability with which he executed his task, he has secured the encomiums of right hon. Gentlemen on both sides, of the old Parliamentary hands; but speaking for the young Parliamentary hands, the new Members, who number something over two hundred, a guileless, sympathetic, and impressionable band, I say they would have been even more pleased at the performance if the hon. and learned Gentleman had been able to produce some of the external effects of believing in the arguments he was advancing, and if we had not been ex-

pecting every moment to hear him say, "My Lord, I am speaking according to my instructions." I could have felt it in my heart to be sorry for him when he said that the persistent questions which had troubled his breast in the past were now unnecessary and out of place if I did not feel confident that in a very few days he will receive his official reward for doing so, and if he had not had the courage to brand those hon. Gentlemen sitting round him as political apostates because they had, to their great material disadvantage, refused to follow him in the course of swallowing his convictions. I confess when he spoke of apostates I thought of Galileo, who went through a form of apostacy when he said the world did not move, and I thought that was the position in which the hon. Gentleman himself was placed. I do not see why he should have adopted this forensic attitude. He has sat at the feet of Gamaliel, and should have been able to give a Delphian response with the air of pronouncing a dogma necessary to salvation. I have not before had the opportunity of hearing the right hon. Member for Midlothian speak in this House, but I knew his powers and realised what they were.

"I knew he could a hair divide  
Between the south and south-west side."

I knew he had the power to use the verb *distinguo* to his own advantage, and make a word have not the natural meaning it would have to our ears, but that which he wished it to have, like one whom the Spanish proverb describes, as giving nothing between two plates. But I did not realise with what enthusiasm his followers would sit down to that windy banquet—that Barmecidal feast. I know I belong to a defeated Party; I thank God I do not belong to a discredited one. I feel confidence because I re-echo the words of our Leaders, that the future is for us, and I feel confident that what the papers are fond of calling a moral victory, which we shall have this evening in the Lobbies, will soon be followed by a real one. I feel confident that that will be another moral victory, for I believe that the measure for which right hon. Gentlemen opposite have broken up their Party and

sacrificed their convictions will be their own undoing, and that in the net which has been laid by them their own foot will be taken. I believe that the discordant elements which are compressed into the majority by the centripetal attraction of Office will not resist the great centrifugal force when hon. Gentlemen pass over to this side of the House; and I further believe that external as well as internal affairs will work against the future of the Government, for I feel convinced that the country at large will very shortly reverse the verdict which has been obtained in this Island by misrepresentations and in the adjoining Island by over-representations. It is on that account that I feel that what the newspapers are so fond of calling a moral victory, which we shall have in the Lobbies this evening, will soon be succeeded by a real one. I shall go to my doom there, feeling confident that at no distant day we shall have a joyful political resurrection.

\*(8.47.) MR. R. L. EVERETT (Suffolk, Woodbridge): I spent a good many hours during the spring and the summer in addressing meetings of my constituents in Suffolk, and I have felt it a very pleasant change to be in this House, listening, as I have done in this Debate, to the speeches of others. I have heard one speech this evening, the speech with which the Debate began, which, as a good Liberal, I feel it to be very difficult to sit down in silence under. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain) was, undoubtedly, an exceedingly clever speech. It was a great treat to us comparatively new Members to watch the right hon. Gentleman, and to mark the skill with which he put forth the matter he has given to us, but I confess the speech was one which moved my indignation. I felt it was a speech, if such a humble person as myself may take the liberty to say so, of neither a Liberal nor of a statesman. It was not the speech of a Liberal. The right hon. Gentleman taunted us, the Liberal Party, with the divisions that prevail amongst us. Now, it is the glory of the Liberal Party to have divisions amongst themselves. We are a Party of Progress; we represent

Mr. Vicary Gibbs

the coming measures; we go forward all of us, but we go forward to a certain extent on different lines, and it was indeed a new thing to hear a Liberal, and one whom we once thought a distinguished Liberal, taunting the Liberal Party with the divisions that are found in it; and I cannot help feeling that the right hon. Gentleman not only taunted us with these divisions, but deliberately and purposely endeavoured with all his might to aggravate them to our injury. It was a speech—and I call all Liberals who heard the speech to witness—deliberately intended to do all the hurt in his power to the Liberal Party. It was the speech not of a friend but of an enemy, and I only justly characterise it when I say it was the speech of the arch enemy of the Liberal Party in this country. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman was not that of a statesman, for it is the duty of statesmen to show how difficulties can best be met. He made no attempt at this. He has not in the least degree contributed to the settlement of this difficulty. He has also shown the grossest inconsistency with his own past utterances. I spent some time yesterday in looking over a volume of the right hon. Gentleman's speeches on the question of Ireland. They were well worth reading, for they set forth with great clearness the wants and needs of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman declared in one of them that of all living men the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian was the fittest and most capable to undertake the settlement of the Irish Question. I cannot, therefore, understand the position which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham has since taken up, neither can the Liberals of this country as a whole. If such a process were possible, I think we should be disposed to drum him out of the Liberal Party, as an unworthy soldier is drummed out of the ranks. I had the privilege of a seat in the House in the Parliament of 1885, when the question of the better government of Ireland was almost the only subject discussed. I lost my seat as a result of voting for Home Rule; but I am glad that I did

vote for it, for I am now more than ever convinced that we shall be doing only what is just and right in giving Ireland the largest possible measure of Home Rule. I have again returned to the House, and the majority which replaced the minority I was in at the previous election shows that my constituents have followed me on this question, and have fully endorsed the vote I gave in 1886. I have improved my position to the extent of 1,000 votes. I come here, however, to find that the question has made no progress whatever. It is most desirable that it should now be settled, because the way is blocked to other great reforms until the Irish Question is disposed of. The fact that the Irish Nationalist Members have come back to the House in the proportion of four out of five shows that the people of Ireland are thoroughly dissatisfied still with the manner in which their country is governed. I think that their discontent is perfectly reasonable, and such as Englishmen would feel if they were governed as Ireland has been governed up to the present time. As the right hon. Member for West Birmingham stated in one of his speeches, it has been a system founded on the bayonets of 30,000 soldiers encamped permanently as in a hostile country, with a Government as centralised and as bureaucratic as that by which Russia governs Poland. This, I say, is the present condition of Ireland, and it must surely be for the general good of the whole country to remove this just cause of discontent. The right hon. Gentleman, however, failed to-night to express one word of regret that this form of government still continues. The question with which the incoming Government will have to deal is, no doubt, a very difficult one. No one denies that. But the Liberal Unionist Members seem positively to gloat over the difficulties, and to roll them as a sweet morsel under their tongues. I can understand an enemy doing that; but I cannot understand how hon. Gentlemen sitting on these Benches, and calling themselves Liberals, can do so. It would be much more patriotic in them to render the best assistance



they can towards the settlement of such a difficult question. Ireland must have more self-government, and if the Liberal Unionists would but loyally help the incoming Administration, she might easily obtain all the self-government which is consistent with the supremacy of the Crown and the legitimate rights of the Imperial Parliament. This difference between them and us is more a difference of degree than of principle; and I would remind them that the question will not settle itself. It will remain in the way until it is settled. The Liberal Party has not put it in the way. It has come up by reason of the past misgovernment of Ireland. Listening to the speech of the hon. Member for Bordesley (Mr. Jesse Collings), I could not help calling to mind the time when the hon. Member, who then sat for Ipswich, was my representative, and, as one of the most advanced Radicals of the day, lifted up his voice against Coercion, and said that on no consideration would he vote for Coercion again. I watched him in the last Parliament. He kept that promise in the letter, but he broke it in the spirit. He did not vote for the Crimes Act, but he helped to maintain in power the Government that did pass it. The Government passed some measures during the past six years conferring boons upon the people of Ireland; but they also passed the Act which put it in the power of the Lord Lieutenant to remove certain Constitutional privileges if he saw fit to do so, and for several years past trial by jury has been taken away in certain parts of Ireland. The Liberals of England heard with shame of the imprisonment of Irishmen. The Speaker has informed us that, in the name of the Commons, he has laid claim to those ancient rights and privileges, our claim to which has been now so long fully recognised. Without disrespect, I venture to express a hope that the claim for "freedom from arrest," which was one of them, will be more effective in this Parliament than in the past. Irish Members who suffered then may rest content, however, with the knowledge that their imprisonment has advanced

*Mr. R. L. Everett*

their cause in the eyes of justice-loving English nation. Moral power, about which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian spoke so eloquently at the close of his great speech, and to which the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House replied in the spirit of entire misunderstanding, is proving itself to be stronger than physical power in dealing with the Irish Question. Now let me address a word to the Conservatives who sit on the opposite benches. I well remember in the Parliament of 1885 the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian speaking with great weight and earnestness on this difficult Irish Question, and urging the then Government—the Conservative Government which was found in office when that Parliament met—to take it up, and to try to bring it to a settlement. He assured them that if they would do so, they would receive from him most loyal and hearty support. But they declined that offer. Now we are wrestling with the question again, and, the majority having passed over to this side of the House, the right hon. Gentleman will himself, if it please God his life is spared, undertake its settlement. As a Liberal, as an Englishman, and as a patriot, I now ask Conservatives to return to the right hon. Gentleman the offer he then made to them, and, instead of trying to increase his difficulties in dealing with this great question, to render him the best assistance in their power in his attempt to bring it to a satisfactory issue.

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne): I should like to say a word on this Debate as a naval man, and also as the Member for a constituency which is solid for the Union and solid against separation. As a naval man I cannot give a silent vote in a Debate which is going to dismiss from Office a Government which, I say, has earned the gratitude of the country. They have done more to maintain the naval supremacy of this country than any Government since the Crimean War. Every interest you possess, whether commercial or otherwise, depends upon your naval supremacy, and if you allow your sea power to decline your prosperity

declines with it. There was a time when the naval power was allowed to decline. I do not say any more about that beyond that it had declined to such an extent that it was absolutely necessary that Her Majesty's Government should resort to heroic measures. The Government has carried out its legislation satisfactorily, and has averted a national calamity, and it is well that the country should be reminded of it, for the country has a short memory. For the first time in the history of the country it was necessary for the Government of the day to put into an Act of Parliament the necessary means to restore the naval supremacy which the last Government had allowed to decline. We shall be perfectly happy to go into Opposition, knowing that the Government which is coming in cannot make ducks and drakes of the Act of Parliament. They can do very little harm until that programme is complete. I hope they do not intend to do any harm; but I am perfectly certain that under the pressure of the Radical economists they would not spend anything on the Navy that they could avoid, and on the Navy your foreign policy depends. How many Members on your side referred to the foreign policy of the country in their Election addresses? None. We are grateful to think that when the change of Government takes place there will be a strong Foreign Minister who will carry out, to a large extent at least, the policy of Lord Salisbury. Already Russia and France are watching with keen interest the prospect of the change of Government, and already action has been taken by Russia in her advance on the Pamirs. As long as it was certain that there was to be no change of Government in this country there was no advance by Russia in that direction. What is the charge against the present Government? The hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) used general terms, and contented himself with saying that the country voted with its eyes open. We say the country voted with its eyes closed. You endeavoured to close their eyes and throw dust in them. How was your majority of forty obtained? We say it was obtained by false pre-

tences and by mendacious statements. I do not charge that against individual Members, because I trust I know what is due to the courtesy of Debate. But we charge against hon. Members that they put Home Rule in the background. The hon. Member who has spoken to-night (Mr. Allen) was not elected on the Home Rule Question.

MR. W. S. ALLEN: I said, Sir, that the Home Rule Question was well to the fore; but that the Eight Hours and other questions were considered.

ADMIRAL FIELD: I say that Home Rule was kept in the background. We have charged that against you for three days. We have been firing at you between wind and water, and you have answered with blank cartridge. You think you are supported by Cork dust and Irish lifebelts. The Scotch majority is a majority purely personal to the individuality of a distinguished Leader; it was not obtained on Home Rule. The Welsh majority was not obtained on Home Rule, it was obtained on Disestablishment. In those constituencies where there are clubs, and where friction of minds brings intelligence, the majorities of the Unionist candidates were largely increased. There were many causes which led to the change in the other constituencies. In some it was love of change. They wanted to give the other people an innings. Was that an Imperial issue? Another cause was the persistent misrepresentation which has taken place on the platforms. I saw a letter in the *Standard* the other day, signed by Mr. R. K. Harvey, of the Arundel Club, in which that gentleman said he attended a meeting at Hunstanton addressed by Mr. Joseph Arch, the Member for North-West Norfolk, and he heard that gentleman say, to the great indignation of the agricultural labourers who heard him, that the Conservatives, in the teeth of the Liberal Opposition, had passed a measure doing away with outdoor relief, and compelling old people to go into the workhouse. The author signed his name to the letter, and I have not yet heard that an action for libel has been commenced against him. That is the way many seats were lost. I say the constituencies were led away

by rubbish like this, and by the miserable Newcastle Programme, and One Man One Vote, and Every Man a Vote. Our reply is that you will not get it. You must have One Vote and One Value for One Vote. Then Ireland would lose twenty Members and Wales would lose three and England would have twenty-three more, and then where would be your majority? I should like to say a word about the Dockyard constituencies which have gone against us. Take the case of Portsmouth. The Fleet was very properly brought to Spithead so that the men could vote, and then no arrangements were made for the men to get ashore. None of the ordinary conveniences were allowed, and the men had to row themselves ashore in a fresh north-easter and in a storm of rain. I do not say whose fault that was, but of course they voted against the Government to a man. Was that Imperialism? It had nothing whatever to do with Home Rule. The sailors would fight against it if necessary, but they did not like to have to pull themselves ashore, and so they went and voted against the Government. I am sorry for their action, and I hope it will not occur again. Well, you have to turn us out, and when that is done we shall watch with much interest when the row begins. You will have Office, but you will not have power, when the House re-assembles. Office without power! I do not envy you. Now, such is the inconsistency of our opponents that they expect this Parliament to pass a Home Rule Bill because they are in a majority of forty, and then the Lords are to accept it. In 1886, when the question was put before the country in all its details, we had a majority of 116. Why did you not abide by that verdict? Is there to be no such thing as finality in fighting great questions? Why, when you were defeated by an overwhelming majority you would not accept the position, and yet you expect us to be conquered with your miserable majority of forty. Not only will the House of Lords be within their rights, but it will be their bounden duty to reject any Home Rule Bill sent up to them passed by a miserable majority of forty Irish votes. I like your inconsistency. You expect the

*Admiral Field*

Lords to swallow forty, and you would not swallow 116. I am weary of this eternal strife over this wretched question. Why did you not accept the verdict of the country like honest men when it was given in such unmistakable terms in 1886? You cannot get rid of it. (Laughter, and a Voice, "You have!") An hon. Member says we have got rid of it. We have not. The result would be the same on the same issue with the same details. I suppose every hon. Member will feel that there should be some safeguards against hasty and ill-considered legislation. You pretend to be the Representatives of a great Democratic Party in the country, and are you ashamed to borrow from the great democratic country across the Atlantic? Give us the safeguards that obtain in America, and you may do what you like. What are the American safeguards? There they must have a two-thirds majority before they are allowed to discuss a Motion on such a question as this, and after that they must have a two-thirds vote to carry it, and when they have carried it they have to go to every State in the Union and get the same question debated there and passed by the same majority; and then, if the people object to any such great change in the Constitution of the United States, they can claim to go to the Supreme Court. We have no safeguards of that kind, and we will ask the House of Lords to stand between us and revolution. (Laughter.) You laugh; but men who laugh are not serious politicians. I listened with deep regret to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian when indirectly he threatened the House of Lords if they should reject his Bill. Was that a statesmanlike act? How can you expect the Lords to accept the miserable majority of forty when you would not accept our majority of 116? I object to this game of see-saw, and I want to know when we are to have finality on any question. As our Leader said in his powerful speech the other evening, there are two parties to the partnership—Great Britain and Ireland. Very well, if one party desires separation, the other party must consent to it. It is all very well for the right hon. Gen-

tleman to make an appeal to the sentiment and honour of England, but great public affairs of nations cannot be conducted on sentimental principles, but on strictly business principles. Unless Home Rule is good for Great Britain as well as for Ireland, hon. Gentlemen have no right to demand it, and if all Ireland—if every man, woman, and child in Ireland—cried out for it, they should never have it unless it were good also for England, Scotland, and Wales. Therefore, you are only beating the air, and you will never get Home Rule while Englishmen are what they are to-day. Hon. Members opposite say they will compel England to give it them. Well, you have done your level best to make us sick of the question. I well remember landing in San Francisco after a long voyage. I was glad to get ashore—(laughter)—yes, but that was because I had nothing to do. If I had been in command I would sooner have been afloat. Well, I went to an hotel in San Francisco, and on the bill of fare presented to me was Irish stew and Land League sauce. Well, we have been living on Irish stew and Land League sauce ever since, and we are sick of it. The hon. Member for Newcastle-under-Lyme (Mr. W. S. Allen), in the course of his speech, pointed to Canada as having been given Home Rule, and he stated that we lost our American Colony because we refused to grant it. I am afraid my hon. Friend has not read his history, and I am sorry, too, that he cannot see the distinction between the case of giving Home Rule to Canada and to Ireland. Does he not know that Ireland is too near to allow her to get Home Rule? Does he not know that it is only sixty miles from Holyhead to Kingstown, and only twelve miles from Stranraer to Larne? Ireland is too near to let her go. You Irish are charming people with a firm government, but you are perfectly unfit for self-government. That is not my opinion alone. Sir Robert Peel said the same thing in opposing O'Connell's Motion for Repeal. He said it would reduce England to a fourth-rate Power and Ireland to a howling wilderness, and that he would sooner see separation than be a party to the Repeal of the Union. Once bit, twice shy—

what Ireland did in 1796 she would do in 1896 under the same circumstances. If we give Home Rule to Ireland there must be a great increase in our Naval and Military Forces. We must hold all your ports in Ireland, for they would be the base of operations for our enemies in time of war. I speak as a naval man who has studied naval questions, and I warn my countrymen of the danger. In 1796, 10,000 men sailed from France in forty-three vessels, of which seven only got back. The storms and the winds sent them to the bottom of the sea; but their want of success was not the fault of the Irish people. What happened then would happen again, and it is our duty, as a great nation, to allow nothing to be done which would interfere with our Imperial interests. Ireland may desire Home Rule, but she will not get it, because it is not good for England or Scotland. England has spoken with no uncertain voice, and by a majority of seventy-five has said, "You shall not have Home Rule," and England and Scotland and Wales together have said the same a second time by a majority of fifteen. Why do not the Irish shake hands all round and give up this demand for Home Rule? The right hon. Gentleman has spoken of a union of hearts. Well, Unionists are quite willing to have a union of hearts if Irishmen will only behave themselves like good people. The right hon. Member for Midlothian, in the course of his eloquent speech, said that Parliament has passed many measures for the good of other portions of the United Kingdom because they desired it, and he asked why Parliament could not pass this measure of Home Rule. There is no parallel between the two cases. We have passed other measures because they were reforms, and we do not pass this because it is revolution. Whatever Ireland may desire in the way of reasonable reform England will be ready to grant. Many hon. Members have said that the State should buy up the Irish railways for the benefit of the country. Well, the Government has done a great deal even in this direction. They have established light railways, and showered blessings on the country in many ways.

The hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Asquith) who moved the Amendment has admitted that golden showers have rained on Ireland, and yet the Irish people are so ungrateful that they describe the Government which has done this as the Government of tyranny and oppression. The one answers the other. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) has alluded to the letter which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) wrote in reference to the statement of Mr. Oscar Browning as to the Imperial supremacy which is to be maintained if Home Rule is granted to Ireland. Mr. Oscar Browning, in the course of his candidature, said he was certain that under any Home Rule Bill the legislation of the Irish Parliament would be subject to the veto of the Crown on the advice of English Ministers. The right hon. Gentleman, in replying to Mr. Oscar Browning, said that that statement was quite correct. And yet we are told by the Irish Party that they will not accept anything of the sort. Now, I wish to quote another important statement made by the right hon. Gentleman since his answer to Mr. Oscar Browning in May last. I carefully copied this quotation from his speech made at Edinburgh on the 1st July. It refers to this question of the supremacy of the English Parliament, and I am afraid it will not be considered quite so satisfactory as the right hon. Gentleman's reply to Mr. Oscar Browning. This is what the right hon. Gentleman said, and hon. Members can read it in the *Times* in the Library—

"Lord Salisbury says the supremacy of Parliament will be a sham."

We all say that.

"Is it a thing unknown to us beyond the limit of our own country? Have we not scattered over the world a number of States, Colonial in their origin, which have in more than one case swollen to national dimensions? Is it not true that every one of these is subject to the supremacy of Parliament? I want to know whether you consider that supremacy is or is not a shadow or a fiction?"

I say that it is a shadow, if not a fiction. The supremacy of Parliament towards our Colonies does not exist in any practical manner.

*Admiral Field*

Speaking on the 4th June, the right hon. Gentleman said that no principle of Home Rule should be laid down for Ireland of which Scotland could not claim the benefit. I suppose the same thing might be said of gallant little Wales and England, and that means four Parliaments, and I suppose another Parliament to govern the lot—five blessed Parliaments just to gratify the ambition of one man in the decline of his life. But we are not going to let the country drift into this mess. There may have been some excuse for an Irish Parliament in 1800; but now the means of communication have been so much improved that we can communicate with Dublin from London as easily as we can communicate across the floor of this House. It was said that the Irish Members had been imprisoned, but they were imprisoned for breaking the law, and they knew what the law was. I thought hon. Members claimed equality before the law; but I think when a Member of Parliament breaks the law he should be subjected to a double punishment. As a humble naval man I have felt it my duty to protest against this vote; and I say that when the history of this period comes to be written it will be stated that the Unionist Government did its duty in standing up for law and order, and for the interests of the Empire.

\* (9.59.) MR. D. H. MACFARLANE (Argyll): I am glad to see the gallant Admiral is as breezy as ever, and I thank him for the compliment he has paid my country. But what are we discussing? There is no question before the House, and we are merely holding a *post mortem* on the present Government. The hon. and gallant Gentleman said that there was no attack made on the present Government. That is perfectly true. We are not here to attack the Government. The Government has been attacked by the voters and condemned. We are not here to make attacks, but to execute the Government. They have been tried already by a jury of their countrymen and condemned. The Solicitor

General says they were not condemned on Home Rule. Very well; then they were condemned on their domestic policy. They say that they are a working man's Government, and the working men of the country have returned a majority of forty against them. Great stress has been laid on the fact that the majority is only forty, and that, therefore, it is an Irish majority; but, as Parties stand in this House, any Government that has a majority which is less than eighty must have an Irish majority. I have listened to many unprofitable Debates in this House, but never to one more unprofitable than this. The Chancellor of the Exchequer talked of a conspiracy of silence, but I think there is a conspiracy which is worse than that, and that is a conspiracy of talk for no practical purpose. Much has been said of the composition of the majority; but what about the composition of the supporters of the Government? First, there are those that neither toil nor spin. (Laughter.) That was the term that was applied to them by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) when he talked about ransom. Now the right hon. Gentleman has turned renegade, or something else, and supports that Party. The right hon. Gentleman has excommunicated the Highlanders because they have returned Members of whose principles he does not approve, and has declared that he will do nothing for them. I do not think they will suffer much from that, and I do not recollect a single instance in which he spoke a word or lifted a finger in their behalf. But it is extraordinary for a statesman to say that because people will not vote in the way he approves he will no longer vote in favour of justice being done to them. The right hon. Gentleman has presumed to censure these people for exercising their political privileges and returning whom they chose, and that censure was accompanied by a threat to leave them to their own devices. That threat will fall harmlessly on the heads of the Highlanders, as the right hon. Gentleman has never done anything for them, and their new Representatives

cannot do less. I was a Home Ruler long before I had the honour of a seat in this House, and I have been one consistently since; the right hon. Gentleman has changed his mind. We have had terrible threats as to the awful consequences which will follow the granting of Home Rule. But when a prophet threatens people in the future we have to look back to the predictions of the same prophet in the past on other matters. We have had the predictions of the Tory Party that every reform proposed in this House or the country would be the forerunner of the ruin of the country. The country is not ruined yet, and all these things have been carried. The only thing that makes me nervous is the saying that "A prophet hath no honour in his own country." If that is the chief mark of a prophet, I am afraid they have shown in this Election that they are without honour in their own country. But I have no fear of the consequences of granting Home Rule. I cannot imagine that Irish people are so foolish, so unwise, so unjust as to take any advantage of minorities in Ireland. There is no evidence on one side or the other on the point; it is only a matter of opinion. I am going, therefore, to record my vote in favour of a just measure of Home Rule for Ireland, but not, however, for any measure for either Ireland or Scotland which, in my humble opinion, will in any way endanger the integrity of the United Kingdom. If, after Home Rule is granted, it should unhappily happen that Ireland proves herself unworthy of that measure, the power that gave it can take it away.

\*(10.10.) SIR HENRY JAMES (Bury): Sir, I think everyone must feel that it is a responsible matter to take part in a Debate of such importance as this now engaging the attention of the House. Others may feel that it is still more responsible for prominent Members of this House to abstain from taking part in the Debate. I also feel that there is no defence necessary for the course that has been taken by those who, under the circum-

stances in which Parliament is now placed, have asked for a full and complete discussion of our political position. Criticisms have been applied to those who have treated this Debate as of great importance. It has been said that it was an unnecessary course for a Government to take to ask that this discussion should take place. It has also been said that there is no precedent for the course pursued; and, lastly, there have been those who have suggested that this Debate has been unnecessarily protracted. As to the first objection, is it unreasonable that when a political Party is claiming a great triumph, and when it is asserting its right to be placed in office and in power, when it is asking that it should have the opportunity of governing this country through an Executive Authority for five or six months, unchecked by Parliament and uncontrolled by criticism, at least an opportunity should be afforded to that Party of giving information to an anxious public desirous to know how it is to be governed during those six months? It is said that there is no precedent for such a course; but what have precedents to do with the position in which we are now placed? There never has been an occasion, I believe I am right in so saying, when any Party has had placed in its hands this uncontrolled and unchecked power of government without making a declaration of its policy, and submitting that policy to the judgment of Parliament. I appeal to my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), with his great experience, has there ever been such an occasion in Parliamentary history?

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE: Yes, in 1841.

\*SIR HENRY JAMES: My right hon. Friend says in 1841 there was an instance similar to this. The business of Parliament was not concluded in 1841.

MR. GLADSTONE: The right hon. Gentleman says there was always a declaration of policy; I met that by saying that in 1841 there was no such declaration.

*Sir Henry James*

\*SIR HENRY JAMES: My right hon. Friend did not listen to my proposition. In 1841 the Liberal Party pursued the course the Government of the present day is pursuing. It met Parliament; it took a hostile vote and was defeated during the month of August, and in the course of that Debate, and in one that took place immediately upon Sir Robert Peel's assumption of office in September, there was a full discussion alike of the policy of the Government that was going out and of the Government that was coming in. If my right hon. Friend will refresh his memory as to what occurred in the Debates in 1841, when the Government of Lord Melbourne was defeated by a majority of ninety-one, and when Sir Robert Peel had formed his Government, he will find that during the course of those Debates there was a full and ample discussion as to what had been the past policy of Lord Melbourne's Government, and what would probably be the policy of the Conservative Party coming into Office. I repeat, that we stand here without any precedent to guide us, because the circumstances are exceptional. It is said, too, Sir, that this has been a protracted Debate. Well, we have one precedent to guide us as to what is protracted Debate when we are discussing the policy of two Parties. In 1886 Parliament met upon the 4th August, the Debate on the Address commenced on the 19th August. There were on that occasion no detailed measures in the Speech from the Throne; it was a simple statement that Parliament should be prorogued, after dealing with some few Votes in Supply, for a fitting season to consider measures tending to the good government of the country. That Debate—beginning on the 19th August—was continued till the 3rd September. Eleven days were spent on a Debate on an Address in reply to a Speech from the Throne as meagre as the one before the House; and if we now ask for a Debate of three nights in relation to circumstances far more momentous, probably, than have ever been before us previously, is

it worthy of those who choose for convenience or policy to take no part in this Debate to object that we, on behalf of our constituents, should do our best to obtain information from them? I will turn at once to the Amendment of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith). He knows I shall not subject him to a very severe criticism. I even congratulate him on being selected as the representative, the champion, of the great Liberal Party. He has been selected to occupy a position of honour; a position of distinction; I hope it is a position of promise to him. Whether he is the right man to occupy that position I very much doubt. He was placed in it under circumstances which, I think, might give rise to some observations and inquiries as to why he was asked to move this Amendment. Sir, my hon. and learned Friend, with becoming modesty, chose to say that what he had said on previous occasions, when he demanded that information should be given to the country as to the intended measure of Home Rule, was of little importance now, and that at some future time he would deal with those inquiries. But he underrates both his own importance and the importance of the inquiry he made; he underrates also the importance of the refusal to give information. And in moving his Amendment I would suggest to him it was his duty, if he did not wish to hear some charge—I will not say of political apostasy—but perhaps of inconsistency, made against him, to explain how it was that when he was addressing his constituents, he demonstrated the moral necessity, the political necessity, of giving this information, and with one hand puts it aside when he comes to this House and tells us it is perfectly unimportant whether we obtain this information or not. Something has been said in the course of this Debate as to the majority upon which my right hon. Friend will have to rely. It is suggested that that majority is not bound together by any agreement upon principle or by any concord upon policy. It is suggested that there were free hands amongst that majority who will, except for the purposes of this one Motion, take their

own course and act upon their own opinions. Well, I know no person better qualified for occupying that position than my hon. and learned Friend the Member for East Fife; and perhaps it may be that my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian, wishing to show how catholic are his views respecting the majority on which he has to rely, selected the most conspicuous of those free hands, and secured my hon. and learned Friend to move this Amendment. I would call my hon. and learned Friend's attention to the position that he occupies now amongst the ranks of the Liberal Party. It is one of singular freedom, upon which he, at least, is to be congratulated. There was a somewhat celebrated meeting of my hon. and learned Friend's constituents, which was remarkable for another reason than that to which I am about to refer, which was held on the 7th June; and my hon. and learned Friend was subjected to some inquiry from those very discerning Scotch electors—they have a name for them in Scotland—who put questions of a very difficult character to candidates who submit themselves to the suffrages of any constituency to answer. Well, there was a certain professor there, and I suppose it was a fair contest between him and my hon. and learned Friend; and that Professor—Mr. Scott Lang—

“referred Mr. Asquith to a speech of his made in January, in which he stated that he did not entertain the slightest doubt that before the General Election Mr. Gladstone would declare the main features of his Home Rule scheme, in addition to those already stated. Mr. Asquith replied that he was still of the same opinion, and that if he were disappointed he would go into Parliament with a perfectly free hand.”

Well, the General Election has taken place. My right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian has addressed his constituents, and no one can for one moment say that he has given any information as to his Home Rule scheme beyond that which he has stated about the difficulty in respect of Irish Members being in this House. He promised that if he returned with



a sufficient majority to conduct public affairs he and his colleagues would endeavour to solve the difficulty of having the Irish Members sitting in this House; but not one single explanation did he give other than that which he had previously given of his proposed scheme of Home Rule. Hence my hon. and learned Friend's disappointment. Hence he comes into Parliament as a disappointed man with a perfectly free hand; and that is the reason, I suppose, why he has been selected to move the Amendment. Can he deny that he is within the Party lines to-night; and when are the fetters on his hands to be thrown off? When is he to become a free hand? I venture to state to the House that the moment this Home Rule scheme is proposed, the moment the information which he has asked for in vain is given, the moment it is shown that the principles he has laid down according to his views to insure the supremacy of Parliament are not accepted, he will be found the freest of hands, and his will be the hand that will stab, from behind, the Leader whom he is now supporting. I do not wish to deal at too great length with my hon. and learned Friend's Amendment, still less with his speech; but will he allow me to say that in that speech of great ability there was a display, as some of us thought, of a little bitterness of tone, which if avoided would have rendered that speech even a greater success than it was? I think there were words that my hon. and learned Friend thought right to use which I hope upon reflection he would not be disposed to employ. He spoke of the "perverted fidelity unexampled in the history of apostacy." These words he thought it right to address to the Liberal Unionist Party. I thought the unmeasured abuse that has been cast upon us during the last six years had passed away. I thought there were some who took a kindly interest in us, but that is not the view of my hon. and learned Friend. I can make no retort upon him. I cannot accuse him of being guilty of any apostacy. He has no political past with which I can deal. He did not enter into this House till 1886, and until the word had been

*Sir Henry James*

spoken by the distinguished Leader of his Party that there was to be Home Rule he was not a Home Ruler; and as the word was spoken he accepted the command and became a Home Ruler, and entered into Parliament as such. But I fear that those who do not know my hon. and learned Friend may charge him with a little too much of self-confidence—perhaps I may say of arrogance—when he charges such men with such a Liberal past as John Bright or the right hon. Member for South Wolverhampton (Mr. C. P. Villiers) with being guilty of political apostacy. What does an apostate mean? Is it a man who changes his faith or opinions for gain, for office, for power? Who are the men who have done that? I will not imitate my hon. and learned Friend. I will not apply such terms to anyone; but I would ask him to consider whether it is becoming in him to use such language to such distinguished—I may add illustrious—men as the men I have mentioned—John Bright and Charles Pelham Villiers? I venture for one moment more to deal with this question of apostacy. I am anxious here, in the presence of my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian, to make an answer to this strong charge of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for East Fife, and to tell my right hon. Friend why it is that we, Liberal Unionists, now occupy the position we do. There were some of us who had been faithful and strong supporters of my right hon. Friend, who knew nothing of apostacy, and who thought little of anything but serving him as faithfully and loyally as we could. We had listened to what he told us. We had obeyed his teaching and wished to follow his precepts; and we knew that my right hon. Friend, shortly before the crisis that drove us into our present position, had laid down the great principle of Parliamentary action. In November, 1885, my right hon. Friend had said—

"Far be it from me to say that the unity of any Party is an object to be preferred to anything. But the point at which our connection should part, if the questions at issue are of vital importance, is a difficult one. I go on now urging unity to the best of my ability. But I hope that the Liberal Party will sever and split rather than sacrifice conscience and principle. There are matters which do not

admit of any compromise. Higher than Party motives are conscientious convictions, and when these come, then is the time to give effect to them."

Does the Mover of the Amendment, I ask, charge us with having acted other than in accordance with conscientious conviction? If he does, let him say so, and make the charge publicly. If he does not, let me call in aid the wise teaching of my right hon. Friend, and let me ask him and all his supporters have we deviated from that teaching in the slightest degree, or from the principles he laid down for us. Mr. Speaker, I almost crave the pardon of the House for dealing with the position of the Liberal Unionist Party at the length I have done; but we have been subjected during the last six years to one continued attack in language more abusive far than that of my hon. and learned Friend's attack. I look in vain for the presence of my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) to-night. I have one word to say to him. For six years he has never spared us. I quite feel personally that I have no reason to think of myself or to complain of myself. He has, however, spoken of us all in language of the most abusive nature. At first his attack generally was on my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain); but when my right hon. Friend made such answer that my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby must have felt that he had not always the best of the contest, why then he has lately turned his attention, since the Duke of Devonshire left this House, to him, feeling may be that, at least, he was not present here to answer him. The right hon. Gentleman has ever been as abusive to us as anyone within the area of public life could be. I do not think we have taken his attacks much to heart. We know that my right hon. Friend is one of those who generally employ strong language. He quite represents Dryden's hero—

"So over-violent or over-civil,  
Every man with him is either God or devil."

Some of us have always hoped that we should be ever included in the second schedule of my right hon. Friend, for to be in the first, to be the subject of his true and complete admiration, it is necessary that you should at some time or other have preached the doctrine of assassination, or have been the associate of those who have. There is one consolation my right hon. Friend always had at the termination of his attacks. I have seen him several times display great emotion on the subject. He was apt to say—"There is a great prospect before us. The time is soon coming when all these apostates shall be swept away." I cannot make myself an equal judge with my right hon. Friend as to what the sweeping process means. But I do not think that to-day, as we stand here, we have been entirely swept away. There have been many Third Parties in this country, but they have never lived long. The supporters of Lord Grenville, Mr. Canning, and Sir Robert Peel—of the latter of whom my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian was a distinguished Member—never survived two General Elections. We Liberal Unionists have had the difficulty of asking support from those who, in 1885, were our sincere supporters, as we were, of my right hon. Friend; and many of us have now received the generous confidence of those who were formerly our political opponents. We have had to appeal to men who were not only strangers to us, but against whom we fought. And as we, for one purpose and one object, left the Leadership of my right hon. Friend, so, with the same purpose and object—the maintenance of the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland—our former opponents have given to us a full, complete, and generous support; and here now, with this crisis still continuing, we stand to maintain the same principles that brought us into existence—principles which, until they have been finally dealt with, we shall never cease to support. I wonder what my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) has to say to-night, after anticipating that, when

Parliament met, as it has now met, he would have a clear field, and we should be swept away? It is inconvenient to him, for some reason, to make the slightest reference to us to-day. We have sought the encounter with him, and we ask for a renewal of the prophecy about the final deluge which should complete our destruction. As has been the case before sometimes, my right hon. Friend finds it convenient to be absent. In one of those very pleasant works of my right hon. Friend the Member for Bridgeton (Sir George Trevelyan)—works that are so full of all that recommends itself to the reader that some say my right hon. Friend is more happy in literature than he is even in politics, he says—

“How easy is the transition from those patriots who have been bursting with heroic rage to the placemen, all tranquillity and smiles.”

For six years the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby has been bursting with heroic rage. (Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT entered the House at this stage, amid ironical cheers from the Ministerial Benches.) I know that the rage was not real. I have too great a confidence in his good disposition to believe that; and as for his heroism, I have still greater doubts about it. But now he is dumb. He is one of those—of the Whig Party—who, when they come into Office,

“Like bees on flowers alighting cease to hum.”

My right hon. Friend has grown dumb in anticipation of Office; but, instead of being a patriot bursting with rage, on this day, which he calls the day of his triumph, he puts us off and tells us that we are to postpone hearing any words from him till that day of “tranquillity and smiles” when he will sit on the Ministerial Bench. He must forgive us if we desire to share his triumph to-day and to take part with him in this discussion after the six years of abuse behind our backs. My right hon. Friend can go down to Lambeth wash-houses and Whitechapel slaughter-houses, and similar places, but he never has

*Sir Henry James*

made one speech in the last five years in which he has not abused the Liberal Unionist Party, and prophesied their entire extinction. Now, when we, still surviving, meet him face to face, he is “all tranquillity and smiles.” The hon. and learned Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) made a confession, at the instigation of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, which I regard as a confession of a most serious character. It has been made, first of all, by an important and distinguished Member of the Liberal Party, and also by the hon. Member who has been selected to open the attack on the present Government. During past years there have been some of us who have said that the country was entitled to information upon the intended Home Rule policy of my right hon. Friend. There were some who said—like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby—that we were not entitled to it. There were others who said we had obtained it; and lately, as we approached the General Election, there were many who said—“What more information can these objectionable people require than we have already given?” Threats were made that, if the Home Rule Bill that was to be framed was sent up to the House of Lords and not accepted by that Assembly, it would be a day of destruction for that House. My right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian, on Tuesday last, also used words which attracted much attention, and which will be represented by some as being of a minatory character. He said the House of Lords would never have a more serious matter to deal with in the interests of the Empire than the question of Home Rule when it should be submitted to them, and that it would never have more serious matter to deal with in their own interests also. I think there will be none, or at any rate few, amongst us who will not agree that when a great measure has been submitted for the approval or disapproval of the country, and when a deliberate opinion has been expressed by the constituencies upon that measure, the House of Lords cannot now refuse to pay attention to the deliberate expression of a democratic opinion by the

electorate of this country. But we know, from the positive statement of the hon. and learned Member for East Fife, that this question of Home Rule, which is to be submitted to the House of Lords, and agreed to by them, has never been submitted to the country, and that the opinion of the electors has not been given upon it. It is better to deal with this matter now—the question of the responsibility and duty of the House of Lords—before the event takes place, than after it. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer said the other night that the opinion of the country had been expressed upon the policy of Home Rule which would be that of the right hon. Member for Midlothian, the right hon. Member for Derby said, “No, it was upon your policy only”; and the hon. and learned Member for East Fife, when the statement was repeated, rose in his place and said—

“That is not what I said. What I stated was that your policy had only been considered and condemned.”

MR. H. H. ASQUITH (Fife, E.): If my right hon. Friend will allow me, I will say that what I stated was that the Irish policy of the Government was considered. I never made any limitation or qualification such as he has just stated.

\*SIR HENRY JAMES: The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that “your policy”—that is, the policy of those who support the right hon. Member for Midlothian—had been considered by the country, and my hon. and learned Friend said, “No, that is not my proposition.” His statement is that the policy which is to be submitted to the House of Lords hereafter has never been submitted to the country, and we know it never has been. We also know that he who had charge of the interests of the Liberal Party in this House had to disclaim any suggestion that he had ever said it.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): No.

\*SIR HENRY JAMES: Now we know what is the Constitutional position that we have to deal with, and I would ask those hon. Members who say they represent democratic interests and believe in democratic institutions—is it their view that a question which affects the whole Constitution of the country should be submitted to the determination of the democracy or not? If they say it ought to be, we start from this point—that it has not been. How, then, is it to be submitted to the consideration of the constituencies? If this majority hold together, and if the Home Rule Bill pass this House, it never can be submitted to the determination of the constituencies of this country except by the action of the House of Lords in sending that Bill down to the consideration of the constituencies and asking their judgment upon it. (“No!”) I perceive there is dissent from that proposition. Will anyone sitting near me, or will any of the right hon. Gentlemen sitting on either side of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, answer me, where is the fault in that argument? Where is the answer? Make it. You may smile, but “tranquillity and smiles” cannot form an answer to my argument. If you dissent from that statement, which I say is step by step correct both as a statement of fact and as a matter of deduction, then in common fairness to your Party, in common justice to the institution you are attacking, make your answer. I venture to suggest that, when we hear this boast of putting an end to the House of Lords, you will have to put an end to the House of Lords for offences more grievous than that of simply asking the opinion of the country upon a measure the very principles of which you have intentionally kept back from the constituencies, who have had no opportunity of expressing a deliberate opinion upon them; and these very constituencies will be the very first to demand that, even for the sake of your Party, their right to express such an opinion

shall not be ignored or taken from them. There are one or two matters only upon which I desire to say a word more. Much reference has been made to the position of Parties in this House, and it is said to be an error for anyone of us to state that my right hon. Friend's Government, when he succeeds to it, as doubtless he will, will be supported by an Irish majority. Well, we need not, I think, discuss with very minute niceness how far you can apportion parts of a majority: but this fact stands forward—that you have now no majority in support of this unknown policy, whatever it will be, in Great Britain, and it exists only in Ireland. Why, it may be asked, do we pick out this Irish majority and say that you are dependent upon it? I will not use again the trite quotation that so many have referred to; but my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian was the statesman who taught us that if we had not a majority from Great Britain to conduct public affairs it would be dangerous, perhaps destructive, for a Government to be controlled by what he termed an Irish majority. These were words of great sagacity when used in November, 1885. They are still more true now. They are being proved to be true at this present moment. In 1885 the Irish Nationalist Members were united. They had one head whom they obeyed and who could control them. It was supposed that they spoke with one voice—one opinion was expressed upon every proposal. But now in Ireland we have two Nationalist Parties, one pitted against the other, and it will not be the opinion of a united Nationalist Party in Ireland that we shall now have to be governed by. It will be by that voice that will speak for the purpose of obtaining support in the polls of Ireland, and a voice that will be in competition with another. Can we conceive any position more humiliating to the great Liberal Party than that it occupies at this moment? (Laughter.) I repeat it—more humiliating than it occupies at this moment. It is about to bear the responsibility—and you will not deny it—of introducing a new measure that shall pull to pieces the Constitution of this country. You may tell me you may replace it, but, at any

*Sir Henry James*

rate, before you replace it you must pull that Constitution to pieces. And now let us picture the Government sitting round the Council Table when the measure will have to be considered. What will be the question that the Advisers of the Queen will then be asking each other? Will they be saying to each other, "Is this unjust—is this a right measure we are proposing?" I may assure my right hon. Friend—I hope he will not think it presumptuous of me—that we give him the fullest—I ought not to say credit—the fullest acknowledgment that he has one sincere and earnest desire, to carry this measure of Home Rule. If that be so, what will be the question that certain statesmen who sit by his side will be asking, and will they not, in their loyalty, in their adherence to their Leader, say, "What is the measure we can carry?" My right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) has said that no measure will be proposed that will not be acceptable to the Irish people. What, then, is the meaning of "the Irish people"?—the Party support of seventy-one Members in this House. And this great measure, which is to deal with interests so mighty as the interests alike of the Empire, of Great Britain, and of Ireland, will depend upon the Parliamentary support that can be obtained from seventy-one Members of this House. If that measure is not made acceptable to their views so as to gain their support, it never can be carried; and if that support can be obtained the measure that will be submitted will be framed so as to secure it. But it is also true, and rightly true, that at this moment the control of the Government of this country is in the hands of a higher power in Ireland. You must remember that behind the Party represented by the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Justin McCarthy) is a power which I am not going to refer to at length to-night—but the power that is now controlling the Liberal Party will be the power that returned seventy-one Irish Members to Parliament. My hon. and learned Friend the Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) said that this Government had chosen

the date for the General Election most suitable to its own interests, and had chosen the time when it could obtain the largest majority. (Cheers.) You cheer that. But there is a Member of your own Party who made a most remarkable prophecy. Mr. Childers said that the number of your supporters would be 355, and the number of Unionists would be 315. He added a rider to that prophecy.

"If," said he, "you take the Election late in the autumn we shall be fifteen worse and the Unionists will be fifteen better."

So, if the General Election had been taken late in the autumn, which the Government of the day could have done, your majority would have been reduced from forty to ten, with the result that the Party led by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond) would have controlled the fortunes of the present Opposition. Sir, this is a time of which the Liberal Party need not be proud. It is a time when they will in a few moments, no doubt, find from the Tellers at this Table that they have obtained a numerical majority. I can anticipate their exultant cheers when the numbers are announced. Let the triumph of to-night be theirs. There are triumphs that are worse than disasters. There are victories better unwon. This will be one of such victories; but before many months are past there will be many who will feel some regret that they have framed and fashioned their policy for the moment to obtain Office, forgetful of the great traditions of their Party. ("Oh!") Only one word more may I say as to the position that we occupy? I have said that we have had a "kindly interest" taken in us of late—since we were not swept away. It has been asked, what position are the Liberal Unionists about to take in public affairs in the future? That question is easy to answer. For six years we have stood in this path. For six years we have saved the position. So long as that is imperilled we stand by this Legislative Union. If you carry its destruction, I admit the

object of our very existence will depart; if you fail in carrying out your policy we shall have succeeded; and then to us will be, not the mere exultant triumph that will follow a numerical majority, but the sure and certain consciousness that we have performed our duty to the best of our ability, and that we have frustrated the plans and objects of those who we believe have neglected their duty alike to their Sovereign and to their country.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. H. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Mr. Speaker: ("Divide!" "Order!" and "Harcourt!")

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Mr. Chaplin.

MR. CHAPLIN: I would gladly give way for the right hon. Member for Derby, whose appearance is evidently expected by this side of the House; but as the right hon. Gentleman, in the exercise of his discretion, thinks it inconsistent with his duty to encourage the continuance of the Debate, I will venture to intervene for a few moments before we go to a Division—a Division which will be of historic interest. We have now been engaged in this Debate for a good many days, and I cannot help feeling that very little remains to be said. It has never been the policy of the Tory Party, and it never will be, to take refuge in a conspiracy of ignoble silence. We think we should be wanting in courtesy and respect, both to the House and to those who have taken part in the Debate, if we were to take no further notice of the course of this discussion. I cannot share the opinion of Gentlemen on the other side that this has been a barren and useless Debate. It has served the purpose of showing prominently to the country and to every impartial person how aimless and how worthless is the policy—if, indeed, it can be dignified by that name—of our opponents. It seems to be a policy of drift and drift. I am quite aware that a policy of drift may sometimes be useful to embarrassed statesmen; it may b

very convenient; but it almost invariably leads to disaster, not only to the Party which practises it, but also to the country which that Party attempts to govern. I turn to the speeches delivered in this House on Tuesday evening by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) and the Leader of the House (Mr. A. J. Balfour) for an illustration of my statement. That was, indeed, an encounter of giants, which we are not likely to see repeated in this House. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) put forth all those powers and all those resources of the art of rhetoric, in which he is without a rival, to bring about the discomfiture of his opponents. He sought, with perfect fairness I admit, to damage the Leader of the Government and his Party in order that he might succeed in ejecting him from power, and occupy the position which the right hon. Gentleman fills at present. But my right hon. Friend was equal to the occasion. I may be pardoned for holding the opinion that in the reply which he delivered to the right hon. Gentleman he was the victor in argument from the beginning, though I cannot expect my opponents to agree in that opinion. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) was unfortunately absent during a portion of the speech of my right hon. Friend, and I am sure I express the sentiments of many Gentlemen on both sides of the House when I say that I am glad to see that he has recovered from the indisposition which I am sure was the only reason that could have kept him away. (Interruption and cries of "Divide!") I should like to remind hon. Members below the Gangway, many of whom are new to the House, that it is by no means unusual to continue a Debate at a quarter past eleven o'clock, especially when it is a Debate upon the issues of which the fortunes of a Government and a country depend. The right hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down (Sir Henry James) referred to some remarks made in the course of this Debate by the right hon. Member for Midlothian with respect to the House of Lords. Those remarks, in my opinion, were premature and uncalled for, because they were based on the assumption that he

*Mr. Chaplin*

will be able to devise a Home Rule measure which is certain to pass through this House. I do not wish in any way to express disbelief in the undoubted powers of the right hon. Gentleman, especially in the direction of constructive legislation; but I am unable to share his sanguine anticipations, and I will venture to direct the attention of the House to three points in vindication of my doubt. In the first place, I will refer to the new conditions which have been imported into the future Home Rule Bill as to the retention of the Irish Members at Westminster; in the second place, I will call attention to the demands by the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond); and, in the third place, I must refer to the question of the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, which was driven home to-night by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham. (Increased interruptions; loud and continued cries of "Divide!") I think it is not too much to ask the House to extend to me the courtesy of listening to me for a few moments. New conditions have been imported into the Home Rule Question by the proposal that the Irish Members shall be retained at Westminster. There are many new Members of this House who, perhaps, have not had the opportunity of listening to former declarations on this subject by the right hon. Gentleman. I have been more fortunate—I was in the House of Commons when the right hon. Gentleman introduced his Home Rule Bill, and I listened to him with the closest attention; and if there was one point more than another on which he laid special emphasis, it was the absolute impossibility of retaining the Irish Members in the English Parliament, and yet grant them a Parliament of their own in Dublin. I will read some portions of the right hon. Gentleman's utterances on the subject. [Mr. Chaplin then proceeded to read a number of extracts from speeches by Mr. Gladstone, but owing to the continual ironical cheering and cries of "Divide!" failed to make himself heard. Comparative quiet having been obtained the right hon. Gentleman resumed]: What did the right hon. Gentleman tell the people of

Midlothian. (Renewed uproar.) I fear some hon. Members have not recovered from the excitement of the General Election. (Loud and prolonged shouts of "Divide!" and "Order!") Even as a humble Member of the Government, I must remind hon. Members, in whatever part of the House they sit, that a great Constitutional question of this kind cannot be discussed without order and decorum. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian has asked what we are to consider the basis of the present Parliamentary system in Ireland. He said, "Is it the present division of the country into districts and the present number of its Members, or will you endeavour to re-construct that system, to re-adjust it with reference to its relations with England and Scotland, or with reference to any other consideration?" Then the right hon. Gentleman comes to the question which the whole Unionist Party have been asking him for six years, "How is it to be done?" What is the answer of the right hon. Gentleman? "They are to be dealt with by the responsible Ministers of the Crown." Of course they are, and the information is as precisely instructive and useful as if the right hon. Gentleman had informed the electors of Midlothian that the Home Rule Bill itself was to be dealt with by the responsible Ministers of the Crown. That is all we have learned during those six years, and, in the absence of further information, I am reluctantly driven to the conclusion that the right hon. Gentleman is doing his best to impose upon the people of the country a scheme which, if I may judge from his own words recorded in *Hansard*, delivered when he was Prime Minister, he knows it will be impossible to carry out. That new condition in itself, even if it stood alone, would be sufficient to place an insuperable obstacle in the way of the successful carrying out of this Bill. But it does not stand alone. I will refer for a moment to the speech of the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. John Redmond), one of the most important and able speeches we have had during this Debate. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian had not the good fortune to hear that

speech, and perhaps I may be allowed to refer to some of the statements in it, in which the hon. Member dealt with pledges which have been given by the Liberal Party. The hon. Member reminded us of the statement of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) that Ireland blocked the way; that not merely the consideration and discussion, but the effective settlement of the Irish National Question must be the first work of the Liberal Party, and that until that settlement had been brought about, those great English questions crying for reform must of necessity remain in abeyance. The pledge given by the Leader of the Liberal Party, as the hon. Member for Waterford reminded us, was that English, Scotch, and Welsh reforms could not be undertaken until the question of Irish Home Rule had been discussed, voted upon, and passed into law. But how, I ask, does this square with the promises the right hon. Gentleman and his friends have so freely given to other sections of the Party on the other side of the House? You have been dangling before the electors the various items of the Newcastle Programme; but you cannot carry out the pledges given on the one side and on the other. If you are going to be true to your promises given to the Irish National Party then you must be false to your pledges on the Newcastle Programme, or if you fulfil the latter then you must play false to the friends of the hon. Member for Waterford. "Are they not written," said the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, "in the chronicles of Newcastle?" Undoubtedly they are, but, unfortunately, if you are going to be true to your promises to the Irish Party, you have no chances, no possibility, of fulfilling your pledges to the electors of this country. In either case right hon. Gentlemen opposite will find themselves in a very difficult position, from which I do not see how they can extricate themselves. Again, the hon. Member for Waterford—(Interruptions)—there was a more important question dealt with by the hon. Member for Waterford to which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain)



has made reference to-night. The hon. Member pointed out as clearly as it was possible to do what the Irish Party meant by the veto upon the proceedings of an Irish Parliament. That veto, he said, was to be exercised in accordance with the advice of Irish Ministers—in accordance with their advice alone. Now I am entitled to ask this question, How does that square with the views of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt)? How can that be reconciled with the declarations of one and all of the Leaders of the Radical Party opposite? I venture to mention this without putting forward the slightest claim for myself as an authority upon Constitutional Law; but I may say it is impossible to dissociate the veto of the Crown from the advice of English Ministers. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby is, or believes himself to be, a great authority on Constitutional Law. Does he deny this assertion on my part? By his silence he admits it.

The right hon. Gentleman's remarks being subjected to continual interruption, which rendered much of what he was saying inaudible,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I hope the House will accord the right hon. Gentleman a patient hearing.

MR. CHAPLIN: This is a most serious question. It is one of the many serious questions which will have to be considered in detail by this House when the Home Rule proposition is before us; but I do not think I am premature in pointing out what appears to me to be the more salient difficulties before you, because the whole of my argument is founded on this—that at present there is neither warrant nor justification for the belief that the right hon. Gentleman and his friends will be able to place on the Table of this House a measure which will have the slightest chance of passing into law. When the House of Lords is warned by men of power and

distinction in this Assembly in terms of veiled menace of what may unhappily await them if they venture to offer opposition to a measure of this kind, I say the House of Lords will long survive the motley crew of this assumed majority, and fearlessly discharge its Constitutional duties. (Renewed interruptions.) I state my opinion, upon which hon. Gentlemen opposite may set what value they please, and I should not be afraid to support my opinion, if this were a fitting occasion, by a sporting wager that, even if this assumed majority live to meet Parliament again—there are recorded instances where Governments have disappeared without meeting Parliament at all—it will never survive an ordinary Parliamentary Session. (Interruptions.) That may be considered a strong expression of opinion, but I have good reason for it in the fact that in the vast majority of cases this majority was obtained under false pretences. My right hon. Friend has referred to some of the amazing fables by which the support of voters has been won. Let me point out one of these fables, which during the past six years has been repeated more often by Members of the Radical Party than others, and for which a very distinguished man is responsible. It has been stated over and over again during this time that we, the Liberal Unionist and Conservative Party, have broken all the pledges we gave at the last General Election—that while we declared we were opposed to a policy of coercion in Ireland, we, in spite of that declaration, passed one of the severest Coercion Laws that ever found a place on the Statute Book. (Interruptions.) I am not in the least surprised that hon. Gentlemen opposite should believe that to be true, because the author of that fable—one of the earliest authors—was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian himself. What did the right hon. Gentleman say during the General Election of 1886? (Interruptions.) It would seem hon. Gentlemen wish to prevent me from continuing—they are afraid of these allusions. During the Election of 1886, the right hon. Gentleman made a charge against the Conservative Party of which I do not

*Mr. Chaplin*

doubt some Members of the present House are unaware.

"There are," he said, "two policies before the nation—two policies which alone have support."

And speaking of the policy of the Tory Party at that time, what was the expression he used? He said—

"Reflect, in the name of Almighty God, in the sanctuary of your chamber, in the sanctuary of your heart and soul, reflect what it is, in this year of 1886, after nearly a century of almost continuous coercion, becoming weaker, more and more odious, and less and less effective as we go along, and repudiated now by the large majority of your Representatives—reflect what it is to propose this as an alternative to the policy of Local Government in Ireland! It is for you to consider it for yourselves, if there are Conservatives among you, to consider for yourselves what you have to do, and to consider what it is you have to answer."

That was the statement of a man. (Prolonged interruptions.) It is evident that, with the voice and lung power with which Providence has endowed me, it is impossible for me to continue to make way against this discourteous treatment offered to a responsible Minister of the Crown, which is new to me and to many experienced Members of this House. I have only this much to say in conclusion. I am grateful to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) for his signification of disapproval of the conduct of his supporters, and I should have been still more so if it had come earlier from the right hon. Gentleman his Leader. I suppose hon. Gentlemen opposite are carried away by the exuberance of their feelings at the thought of the great triumph in reserve for them. But I am not at all sure that these feelings are shared by all the Members of the Party opposite. We are told they represent the Party of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, returned to the House of Commons in a triumphant majority as the result of a General Election. But I should not have thought from their appearance that right hon. Gentlemen on the opposite Bench represented a triumphant Party. I must confess I have never seen a more dolorous expression of countenance than that pervading the Front Opposition Bench during the speech of my right hon. Friend the

Member for West Birmingham this afternoon. As I watched them across the Table, and when I saw there was not a single man upon that Bench with either the courage or the chivalry to get up and reply to what, after many years' experience, undoubtedly seemed to me to be the unequalled indictment brought against them by my right hon. Friend, I said to myself this is not the attitude of men who have either hope, belief, or confidence in their cause. No, Sir; it is the attitude of a Party to whom the still small voice of conscience has whispered—as at times it whispers to us all—that for the sake of Party and political gain they have betrayed the highest interests of their country, and that they are predestined and foredoomed, at no distant date, to irreparable disaster and disgrace.

(12.0.) Question put.

(12.5.) The House divided:—Ayes. 350; Noes 310.—(Div. List, No. 1.)

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, as followeth:—

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal Subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled, beg leave to thank Your Majesty for the most Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

We feel it, however, to be our duty humbly to submit to Your Majesty that it is essential that Your Majesty's Government should possess the confidence of this House and of the Country, and respectfully to represent to Your Majesty that such confidence is not reposed in the present Advisers of Your Majesty."

To be presented by Privy Counsellors.

#### MAIL SHIPS ACT, 1891.

Copy presented,—of Order in Council, dated 5th August, 1892, entitled The Mail Ships (France) Order in Council,

1892 (South Australia and Western Australia) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented,—of Statute made by the University of Oxford on 16th March, 1892, for altering the Title of the Linacre Professor of Human and Comparative Anatomy [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 9].

#### WINTER ASSIZES ACTS, 1876 AND 1877.

Copy presented,—of Eight Orders in Council, dated 5th August, 1892, relating to the ensuing Winter Assizes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented,—of Minutes of Evidence taken by the Committee appointed to inquire as to the best means of distributing the Grant in Aid of Secondary Education in Scotland, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented,—of Minute of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland, dated 11th August, 1892, providing for the distribution of the Sum available for Secondary Education under Section 2 (1) (b) of "The Education and Local Taxation Account (Scotland) Act, 1892" [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table :—List of the Bills, Reports, Estimates, and Accounts and Papers printed by order of the House, and of Papers presented by Command, Session II., 1892; with a General Alphabetical Index thereto, 25th Parliament, First Session, 55 and 56 Vic., 4th August to 18th August, 1892, to be printed. [No. 12].

#### EAST INDIA (INDIA OFFICE, RETIREMENT AT 65).

Copy ordered—

"Of Minute by the Secretary of State for India, showing the manner in which effect has been given to Clause 10 of the Order in Council of 15th August, 1890, which directs the Retirement of Civil Servants at the age of 65."—(*Mr. Marjoribanks.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 13].

#### RICHMOND BRIDEWELL (DUBLIN) EXPENDITURE.

Address for—

"Return of (I.) Particulars of Expenditure on construction and maintenance of the buildings recently known as the Richmond Bridewell, Dublin, and of the acreage covered by the prison and grounds; and (II.) Particulars of any Compensation given to Local Authorities in Great Britain for surrendering Prison Buildings and Sites."—(*Mr. Hibbert.*)

#### ADJOURNMENT.

(12.25.) THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): After the important Division which has just taken place, it will probably be for the convenience of the House that we should adjourn until Thursday next, and I beg to make that Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn till Thursday next."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Twelve o'clock till Thursday next.

## DIVISION LIST.

COMMONS, THURSDAY, 11<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST, 1892.

### QUEEN'S SPEECH.

On Amendment proposed to Question [8th August], "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, as followeth:—

‘MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal Subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled, beg leave to thank Your Majesty for the most Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.”

—(*Mr. Barton.*)

And which Amendment was,

At the end of the Question, to add the words,—“We feel it, however, to be our duty humbly to submit to Your Majesty that it is essential that Your Majesty's Government should possess the confidence of this House and of the Country, and respectfully to represent to Your Majesty that such confidence is not reposed in the present Advisers of Your Majesty.”—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Motion made, and Question proposed, “That those words be there added.”

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 350; Noes, 310; Majority, 40.

### AYES.

ABRAHAM, WILLIAM (Glamorgan, Rhondda)  
 ACLAND, A. H. DYKE (York, W.R., Rotherham)  
 AINSWORTH, D. (Cumberland, Egremont)  
 ALLEN, CHARLES (Pembroke)  
 ALLEN, W. S. (Newcastle-under-Lyme)  
 ALLISON, R. A. (Cumberland, Eskdale)  
 AMBROSE, DR. DANIEL (Louth, S.)  
 ARCH, JOSEPH (Norfolk, N.W.)  
 ASHER, A. (Elgin Burghs)  
 ASQUITH, H. H. (Fife, E.)  
 ATHERLEY-JONES, L. (Durham, N.W.)  
 AUSTIN, JOHN (York, W.R., Osgoldcross)  
 AUSTIN, W. (Limerick, W.)  
 BAKER, J. (Portsmouth)  
 BALFOUR, J. B. (Clackmannan)  
 BALFOUR, J. SPENCER (Burnley)  
 BALLANTINE, W. H. W. (Coventry)  
 BARLOW, J. E. (Somerset, Frome)  
 BARRAN, J. (York, W.R., Otley)  
 BARROW, R. V. (Southwark, Bermondsey)

BARRY, EDWARD (Cork, S.)  
 BARRY, JOHN (Wexford, S.)  
 BAYLEY, EDWARD (Camberwell, N.)  
 BAYLEY, THOMAS (Derbyshire, Chesterfield)  
 BEAUFOY, MARK (Lambeth, Kennington)  
 BEITH, GILBERT (Inverness Burghs)  
 BENN, WILLIAMS (Tower Hamlets, St. George's)  
 BENNETT, J. (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough)  
 BENSON, G. R. (Oxford, Woodstock)  
 BILLSON, A. (Devon, Barnstaple)  
 BIRKMYRE, W. (Ayr Burghs)  
 BIRRELL, AUSTIN (Fife, W.)  
 BLAKE, EDWARD (Longford, S.)  
 BODKIN, M. M. (Roscommon, N.)  
 BOLTON, T. DOLLING (Derbyshire, N.E.)  
 BOLTON, THOMAS H. (St. Pancras, N.)  
 BRAND, A. G. (Cambridge, Wisbech)  
 BRIGHT, JACOB (Manchester, S.W.)  
 BROAD, H. E. (Derbyshire, S.)

VOL. VII. [FOURTH SERIES.]

T

- BRUNNER, J. T. (Cheshire, Northwich)  
 BRYCE, JAMES (Aberdeen, S.)  
 BURNIE, R. J. D. (Swansea, Town)  
 BURNS, JOHN (Battersea)  
 BURT, THOMAS (Morpeth)  
 BUXTON, SYDNEY (Tower Hamlets, Poplar)  
 BYLES, W. P. (York, W.R., Shipley)  
 CAINE, W. S. (Bradford, E.)  
 CAMERON, DR. C. (Glasgow, College)  
 CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, H. (Stirling Burghs)  
 CARMICHAEL, SIR JAMES (Glasgow, St. Rollox)  
 CARVILL, P. G. H. (Newry)  
 CAUSTON, R. K. (Southwark, W.)  
 CHANCE, P. A. (Kilkenny, S.)  
 CHANNING, F. A. (Northampton, E.)  
 CHEETHAM, J. M. (Oldham)  
 CLANCY, J. J. (Dublin County, N.)  
 CLARK, DR. G. B. (Caithness)  
 CLOUGH, W. O. (Portsmouth)  
 COBB, H. P. (Warwickshire, Rugby)  
 COLDWELLS, F. M. (Lambeth, N.)  
 COLERIDGE, BERNARD (Sheffield, Attercliffe)  
 COLLERY, B. (Sligo, N.)  
 COLMAN, J. J. (Norwich)  
 COMPTON, EARL (York, W.R., Barnsley)  
 CONDON, T. J. (Tipperary, E.)  
 CONYBEARE, C. A. V. (Cornwall, Camborne)  
 COZENS-HARDY, H. H. (Norfolk, N.)  
 CRAWFORD, DONALD (Lanark, N.E.)  
 CREAM, E. (Queen's County, Ossory)  
 CREMER, W. R. (Shoreditch, Haggerston)  
 CRILLY, D. (Mayo, N.)  
 CROMBIE, J. W. (Kincardineshire)  
 CROSFIELD, W. (Lincoln)  
 CURRAN, THOMAS B. (Kilkenny)  
 DALZIEL, J. H. (Kirkcaldy Burghs)  
 DAVIES, W. REES (Pembrokeshire)  
 DAVITT, MICHAEL (Meath, N.)  
 DEASY, J. (Mayo, W.)  
 DIAMOND, C. (Monaghan, N.)  
 DILKE, SIR CHARLES (Gloucester, Forest of Dean)  
 DILLON, JOHN (Mayo, E.)  
 DODD, CYRIL (Essex, Maldon)  
 DONELAN, Captain (Cork, E.)  
 DUFF, R. W. (Banffshire)  
 DUNN, W. (Paisley)  
 EDWARDS, F. (Radnorshire)  
 ELLIS, JOHN (Nottingham, Rushcliffe)  
 ELLIS, THOMAS (Merionethshire)  
 ESMONDE, SIR THOMAS (Kerry, W.)  
 ESSLEMONT, P. (Aberdeenshire, E.)  
 EVANS, FRANCIS (Southampton)  
 EVANS, SAMUEL (Glamorgan, Mid)  
 EVERETT, R. L. (Suffolk, Woodbridge)  
 EVERSHED, SYDNEY (Staffordshire, Burton)  
 FARQUHARSON, DR. ROBERT (Aberdeenshire, W.)  
 FENWICK, CHARLES (Northumberland, Wansbeck)  
 FENWICK, Captain H. T. (Durham, Houghton-le-Spring)  
 FERGUSON, R. C. MUNRO (Leith Burghs)  
 FIELD, WILLIAM (Dublin, St. Patrick's)  
 FINUCANE, J. (Limerick, E.)  
 FLEMING, C. J. (York, W.R., Doncaster)  
 FLOWER, CYRIL (Bedford, Luton)  
 FLYNN, J. C. (Cork, N.)  
 FOLEY, P. J. (Galway, Connemara)  
 FOSTER, SIR WALTER (Derby, Ilkeston)  
 FOWLER, H. H. (Wolverhampton, E.)  
 FOWLER, MATTHEW (Durham)  
 FOX, DR. (King's County, Tullamore)  
 FRY, THEODORE (Darlington)  
 FRYE, FREDERICK C. (Kensington, N.)  
 FULLAM, P. (Meath, S.)  
 FULLER, G. P. (Wilts, Westbury)  
 FURNESS, C. (Hartlepool)  
 GANE, LAWRENCE (Leeds, E.)  
 GARDNER, HERBERT (Essex, Saffron Walden)  
 GILHOOLY, J. (Cork, W.)  
 GLADSTONE, W. E. (Edinburgh, Midlothian)  
 GLADSTONE, HERBERT (Leeds, W.)  
 GOURLEY, E. T. (Sunderland)  
 GRENFELL, W. H. (Hereford)  
 GREY, SIR EDWARD (Northumberland, Berwick)  
 GROVE, ARCHIBALD (West Ham, N.)  
 GULLY, W. C. (Carlisle)  
 GUTHRIE, D. C. (Northampton, S.)  
 HALDANE, R. B. (Haddington)  
 HAMMOND, J. (Carlow)  
 HARCOURT, SIR WILLIAM (Derby)  
 HARDIE, KEIR (West Ham, S.)  
 HARRINGTON, TIMOTHY (Dublin, Harbour)  
 HAYDEN, L. P. (Roscommon, S.)  
 HEALY, MAURICE (Cork)  
 HEALY, THOMAS (Wexford, N.)  
 HEALY, TIMOTHY (Louth, N.)  
 HIBBERT, J. T. (Oldham)  
 HIGGINS, CLEMENT (Norfolk, Mid)  
 HINGLEY, B. (Worcester, N.)  
 HOARE, HUGH (Cambridge, Chesterton)  
 HOBHOUSE, CHARLES (Wilts, Devizes)  
 HOLDEN, ANGUS (York, E.R., Buckrose)  
 HOLDEN, ISAAC (York, W.R., Keighley)  
 HOLLAND, W. H. (Salford, N.)  
 HOPWOOD, C. H. (Lancashire, S.E., Middleton)  
 HOWELL, GEORGE (Bethnal Green, N.E.)  
 HUNTER, W. A. (Aberdeen, N.)  
 HUNTINGTON, C. P. (Lancashire, N.E., Darwen)  
 HUSBAND, J. (Wilts, Cricklade)  
 HUTTON, A. E. (York, W.R., Morley)  
 ILLINGWORTH, A. (Bradford, W.)  
 INGRAM, W. J. (Boston)  
 JACKS, W. (Stirlingshire)  
 JACOBY, J. A. (Derbyshire, Mid)  
 JAMES, WALTER H. (Gateshead)  
 JOHNSON-FERGUSON, J. E. (Leicester, Loughborough)  
 JOICEY, J. (Durham, Chester-le-Street)  
 JONES, Major E. R. (Carmarthen District)  
 JONES, BRYNMOR (Gloucester, Stroud)

- JOSSE, HENRI (Great Grimsby)  
 KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, Sir UGHTRED (Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe)  
 KEARLEY, H. E. (Devonport)  
 KEAY, SEYMOUR (Elgin and Nairn)  
 KENNEDY, P. J. (Kildare, N.)  
 KENNY, JOSEPH (Cork, S.)  
 KENNY, MATTHEW (Tyrone, Mid)  
 KILBRIDE, DENIS (Kerry, S.)  
 KINLOCH, Sir JOHN (Perth, E.)  
 KITSON, Sir JAMES (York, W.R., Colne Valley)  
 KNOX, VESEY (Cavan, W.)  
 LABOUCHERE, H. (Northampton)  
 LAMBERT, G. (Devon, South Molton)  
 LAWSON, Sir WILFRID (Cumberland, Cocker-mouth)  
 LEAKE, R. (Lancashire, S.E., Radcliffe)  
 LEESE, J. F. (Lancashire, N.E., Accrington)  
 LEFEVRE, SHAW (Bradford, Central)  
 LEIGH, JOSEPH (Stockport)  
 LENG, JOHN (Dundee)  
 LEON, H. S. (Butts, N.)  
 LEVESON-GOWER, G. (Stoke-on-Trent)  
 LEWIS, JOHN H. (Flint District)  
 LEWIS, THOMAS P. (Anglesey)  
 LITTLE, T. S. (Whitehaven)  
 LLOYD-GEORGE, D. (Carnarvon District)  
 LOCKWOOD, FRANK (York)  
 LOGAN, J. W. (Leicester, Harborough)  
 LOUGH, THOMAS (Islington, W.)  
 LUTTRELL, H. F. (Devon, Tavistock)  
 LYELL, LEONARD (Orkney and Shetland)  
 MACDONALD, MURRAY (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley)  
 MACFARLANE, D. H. (Argyllshire)  
 MACGREGOR, Dr. (Invernessshire)  
 MAC NEILL, SWIFT (Donegal, S.)  
 MCARTHUR, WILLIAM (Cornwall, St. Austell)  
 MCCARTAN, M. (Down, S.)  
 MCCARTHY, JOHN (Tipperary, Mid)  
 MCCARTHY, JUSTIN (Longford, N.)  
 MCDEEMOTT, P. (Kilkenny, N.)  
 McDONNELL, M. A. (Queen's County, Leix)  
 M'EWAN, W. (Edinburgh, Central)  
 M'HUGH, E. (Armagh, S.)  
 M'HUGH, PATRICK (Leitrim, N.)  
 M'LAGAN, PETER (Linlithgow)  
 McLAREN, CHARLES (Leicestershire, Bosworth)  
 McLAREN, WALTER (Cheshire, Crewe)  
 MADEN, J. H. (Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale)  
 MAGILLIGAN, P. (Fermanagh, S.)  
 MAGUIRE, J. R. (Clare, W.)  
 MAINS, J. (Donegal, N.)  
 MATTLAND, W. F. (Brecknockshire)  
 MANDEVILLE, J. F. (Tipperary, S.)  
 MANFIELD, M. P. (Northampton)  
 MAPPIN, Sir FREDERICK (York, W.R., Hallamshire)  
 MATHER, WILLIAM (Lancashire, S.E., Gorton)  
 MELLOR, J. W. (York, W.R., Sowerby)  
 MINCH, MATTHEW (Kildare, S.)  
 MOLLOY, B. C. (King's County, Birr)  
 MONTAGU, SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, White-chapel)  
 MOORSOM, J. M. (Yarmouth)  
 MORGAN, G. OSBORNE (Denbighshire, E.)  
 MORGAN, LLOYD (Carmarthenshire, W.)  
 MORGAN, PRITCHARD (Merthyr Tydvil)  
 MORLEY, JOHN (Newcastle-on-Tyne)  
 MORROGH, JOHN (Cork, S.E.)  
 MORTON, ALPHEUS C. (Peterborough)  
 MORTON, E. J. C. (Devonport)  
 MUNDELLA, A. J. (Sheffield, Brightside)  
 NAOROJI, D. (Finsbury, Central)  
 NAPIER, M. F. (Roxburghshire)  
 NEVILLE, RALPH (Liverpool, Exchange)  
 NEWNES, GEORGE (Cambridge, Newmarket)  
 NOLAN, Colonel (Galway, N.)  
 NORTON, Captain CECIL (Newington, W.)  
 O'BRIEN, J. F. X. (Mayo, S.)  
 O'BRIEN, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
 O'BRIEN, WILLIAM (Cork)  
 O'CONNOR, ARTHUR (Donegal, E.)  
 O'CONNOR, JAMES (Wicklow, W.)  
 O'CONNOR, T. P. (Liverpool, Scotland)  
 O'DRISCOLL, FLORENCE (Monaghan, S.)  
 O'KEEFFE, F. A. (Limerick)  
 OLDROYD, MARK (Dewsbury)  
 OWEN, THOMAS (Cornwall, Launceston)  
 PALMER, Sir CHARLES (Durham, Jarrow)  
 PALMER, GEORGE (Reading)  
 PAUL, HERBERT (Edinburgh, S.)  
 PAULTON, J. M. (Durham, Bishop Auckland)  
 PEASE, HENRY FELL (Yorks., N.R., Cleveland)  
 PEASE, JOSEPH A. (Northumberland, Tyneside)  
 PEASE, Sir JOSEPH (Durham, Barnard Castle)  
 PERKS, R. W. (Lincolnshire, Louth)  
 PHILIPPS, WYNFORD (Lanark, Mid)  
 PICKARD, B. (York, W.R., Normanton)  
 PICKERSGILL, E. H. (Bethnal Green, S.W.)  
 PICTON, J. A. (Leicester)  
 PINKERTON, JOHN (Galway)  
 PLAYFAIR, Sir LYON (Leeds, S.)  
 POTTER, T. B. (Rochdale)  
 POWER, P. J. (Waterford, E.)  
 PRICE, ROBERT J. (Norfolk, E.)  
 PRICE, Captain THOMAS P. (Monmouth, S.)  
 PRIESTLEY, BRIGGS (York, W.R., Pudsey)  
 PROVAND, A. D. (Glasgow, Blackfriars)  
 RANDELL, D. (Glamorgan, Gower)  
 RATHBONE, W. (Carnarvon, Arfon)  
 REDMOND, JOHN (Waterford)  
 REDMOND, WILLIAM (Clare, E.)  
 REED, Sir EDWARD (Cardiff)  
 REID, R. T. (Dumfries Burghs)  
 RENDEL, STUART (Montgomeryshire)  
 REYNOLDS, W. J. (Tyrone, E.)  
 RICHARDSON, J. (Durham, S.E.)  
 RIGBY, JOHN (Forfarshire)  
 ROBERTS, BRYN (Carnarvon, Eiflon)  
 ROBERTS, HERBERT (Denbighshire, W.)  
 ROBERTSON, E. (Dundee)

ROBINSON, THOMAS (Gloucester)  
 ROBY, H. J. (Lancashire, S.E., Eccles)  
 ROCHE, JOHN (Galway, E.)  
 ROE, THOMAS (Derby)  
 ROSCOE, Sir HENRY (Manchester, S.)  
 ROUNDELL, C. S. (York, W.R., Skipton)  
 ROWLANDS, JAMES (Finsbury, E.)  
 ROWLANDS, BOWEN (Cardiganshire)  
 RUSSELL, Sir CHARLES (Hackney, S.)  
 RUSSELL, G. W. E. (Bedford, Biggleswade)  
 SAMUELSON, Sir BERNHARD (Oxford, Banbury)  
 SAUNDERS, W. (Newington, Walworth)  
 SCHWANN, C. E. (Manchester, N.)  
 SEALE-HAYNE, C. (Devon, Ashburton)  
 SEXTON, T. (Kerry, N.)  
 SHAW, CHARLES (Stafford)  
 SHAW, THOMAS (Halifax)  
 SHAW, THOMAS (Hawick Burghs)  
 SHEEHAN, J. D. (Kerry, E.)  
 SHEEHY, D. (Galway, S.)  
 SINCLAIR, Captain JOHN (Dumbartonshire)  
 SMITH, CLARENCE (Hull, E.)  
 SMITH, HARRY (Falkirk Burghs)  
 SMITH, SAMUEL (Flintshire)  
 SMITH, WILLIAM (Lancashire, N., North  
 Lonsdale)  
 SNARE, THOMAS (Lancashire, S.E., Heywood)  
 SPENCER, C. R. (Northampton, Mid)  
 SPYKE, ALBERT (Monmouth District)  
 SPANFELD, J. (Halifax)  
 STEEN, SYDNEY (Suffolk, Stowmarket)  
 STEVENSON, FRANCIS (Suffolk, Eye)  
 STEVENSON, JAMES (South Shields)  
 STEWART, HALLEY (Lincolnshire, Spalding)  
 STONEY, SAMUEL (Sunderland)  
 STRACHEY, E. (Somerset, S.)  
 STUART, JAMES (Shoreditch, Hoxton)  
 SULLIVAN, DONAL (Westmeath, S.)  
 SULLIVAN, T. D. (Donegal, W.)  
 SUMMERS, W. (Huddersfield)  
 SUTHERLAND, ANGUS (Sutherlandshire)  
 SWEETMAN, J. (Wicklow, E.)

TANNER, Dr. (Cork, Mid)  
 THOMAS, ABEL (Carmarthen, E.)  
 THOMAS, ALFRED (Glamorgan, E.)  
 THOMAS, DAVID (Merthyr Tydvil)  
 TOWNSEND, C. (Bristol, N.)  
 TREVELYAN, Sir GEORGE (Glasgow, Bridgeton)  
 TUITE, JAMES (Westmeath, N.)  
 TULLY, JASPER (Leitrim, S.)  
 VIVIAN, Sir HUSSEY (Swansea, District)  
 WADDY, S. D. (Lincolnshire, Brigg)  
 WALLACE, STEWART (Tower Hamlets, Lime-  
 house)  
 WALLACE, ROBERT (Edinburgh, E.)  
 WARMINGTON, C. M. (Monmouth, N.)  
 WARNER, T. C. T. (Somerset, N.)  
 WASON, EUGENE (Ayrshire, S.)  
 WAYMAN, T. (York, W.R., Elland)  
 WEBB, ALFRED (Waterford, W.)  
 WEIR, J. G. (Ross and Cromarty)  
 WESTON, Sir JOSEPH (Bristol, E.)  
 WHITBREAD, SAMUEL (Bedford)  
 WHITEHEAD, Sir JAMES (Leicester)  
 WHITTAKER, T. P. (York, W.R., Spen Valley)  
 WILL, SHIRESS (Montrose Burghs)  
 WILLIAMS, ARTHUR (Glamorgan, S.)  
 WILLIAMS, CARVELL (Nottingham, Mansfield)  
 WILLIAMSON, JAMES (Lancashire, N.,  
 Lancaster)  
 WILLIAMSON, STEPHEN (Kilmarnock Burghs)  
 WILSON, CHARLES H. (Hull, W.)  
 WILSON, HENRY J. (York, W.R., Holmfirth)  
 WILSON, JOHN (Durham, Mid)  
 WILSON, JOHN (Lanark, Govan)  
 WILSON, HAVELOCK (Middlesbrough)  
 WOODALL, W. (Hanley)  
 WOODS, SAMUEL (Lancashire, S.W., Ince)  
 WRIGHT, CALEB (Lancashire, S.W., Leigh)  
 YOUNG, S. (Cavan, E.)

## TELLERS.

Mr. ARNOLD MORLEY.

Mr. MARJORIBANKS.

## NOES.

ACLAND-HOOD, Sir ALEXANDER (Somerset,  
 Wellington)  
 ADDISON, J. E. W. (Ashton-under-Lyne)  
 AGG-GARDNER, J. T. (Cheltenham)  
 AIRD, JOHN (Paddington, N.)  
 ALLSOPP, GEORGE (Worcester)  
 ALLSOPP, PERCY (Taunton)  
 AMBROSE, WILLIAM (Middlesex, Harrow)  
 ANSTRUTHER, H. T. (St. Andrew's Burghs)  
 ARNOLD-FOSTER, H. O. (Belfast, W.)  
 ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, ELLIS (Sheffield, Eccles-  
 hall)  
 BADEN-POWELL, Sir GEORGE (Liverpool,  
 Kirkdale)  
 BAGOT, Captain (Westmoreland, Kendal)  
 BAIRD, J. G. A. (Glasgow, Central)

BALDWIN, A. (Worcestershire, Bewdley)  
 BALFOUR, A. J. (Manchester, E.)  
 BALFOUR, GERALD (Leeds, Central)  
 BANBURY, F. G. (Camberwell, Peckham)  
 BARRY, FRANCIS TRESS (Windsor)  
 BARTLEY, G. C. T. (Islington, N.)  
 BARTON, D. P. (Armagh, Mid)  
 BARTTELOT, Sir WALTER (Sussex, North-West)  
 BASS, H. A. (Stafford, W.)  
 BEACH, Sir MICHAEL HICKS (Bristol, W.)  
 BEACH, W. W. B. (Hants, Andover)  
 B  
 W. (York, N.R., Whitby)  
 1 G. CAVENDISH (Penrhyn and

der (York, E.R., Holder-

- BIDDULPH, M. (Herefordshire, Ross)  
 BIGWOOD, J. (Middlesex, Brentford)  
 BILL, CHARLES (Stafford, Leek)  
 BOLITHO, T. B. (Cornwall, St. Ives)  
 BONSOR, H. C. O. (Surrey, Wimbledon)  
 BOORD, T. W. (Greenwich)  
 BORTHWICK, Sir ALGERNON (Kensington, S.)  
 BOULNOIS, E. (Marylebone, E.)  
 BOUSFIELD, W. R. (Hackney, N.)  
 BOWLES, Captain (Middlesex, Enfield)  
 BOWLES, T. GIBSON (King's Lynn)  
 BRIDGEMAN, Colonel (Bolton)  
 BRIGHT, JOHN ALBERT (Birmingham, Central)  
 BRODRICK, St. JOHN (Surrey, Guildford)  
 BROMLEY-DAVENPORT, W. (Cheshire, Macclesfield)  
 BROOKFIELD, A. M. (Sussex, Rye)  
 BROWN, ALEXANDER (Shropshire, Wellington)  
 BRYMER, W. E. (Dorset, S.)  
 BUCKNILL, T. T. (Surrey, Epsom)  
 BURDETT-COUTTS, W. (Westminster)  
 BURGHEY, Lord (Northampton, N.)  
 BURY, Viscount (Birkenhead)  
 BUTCHER, J. G. (York)  
 BYRNE, E. W. (Essex, Walthamstow)  
 CAMPBELL, J. A. (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities)  
 CARMARTHEN, Marquess of (Lambeth, Brixton)  
 CARSON, E. (Dublin University)  
 CAYENDISH, VICTOR (Derbyshire, W.)  
 CAYZER, C. W. (Barrow-in-Furness)  
 CHAMBERLAIN, JOSEPH (Birmingham, W.)  
 CHAMBERLAIN, AUSTEN (Worcestershire, E.)  
 CHAMBERLAYNE, T. (Southampton)  
 CHAPLIN, H. (Lincolnshire, Sleaford)  
 CHARLESWORTH, Colonel (Wakefield)  
 CHARRINGTON, SPENCER (Tower Hamlets, Mile End)  
 CHESNEY, Sir GEORGE (Oxford)  
 CHURCHILL, Lord RANDOLPH (Paddington, S.)  
 CLARKE, Sir EDWARD (Plymouth)  
 CLAYTON, N. G. (Northumberland, Hexham)  
 COCHRANE, THOMAS (Ayrshire, N.)  
 CODDINGTON, W. (Blackburn)  
 COHEN, B. L. (Islington, E.)  
 COLLINGS, JESSE (Birmingham, Bordesley)  
 COLSTON, C. E. H. (Gloucester, Thornbury)  
 COMBE, C. H. (Surrey, Chertsey)  
 CONNOR, C. C. (Antrim, N.)  
 CORBETT, A. CAMERON (Glasgow, Tradeston)  
 CORNWALLIS, F. S. W. (Maidstone)  
 COTTON JODRELL, Colonel (Cheshire, Wirral)  
 COURTNEY, L. H. (Cornwall, Bodmin)  
 CROSS, ALEXANDER (Glasgow, Camlachie)  
 CROSS, WILLIAM H. (Liverpool, West Derby)  
 CUBITT, H. (Surrey, Reigate)  
 CURRIE, Sir DONALD (Perth, W.)  
 CURZON, G. N. (Lancashire, S.W., Southport)  
 CURZON, Viscount (Bucks, Wycombe)  
 CUST, H. J. C. (Lincolnshire, Stamford)  
 DALRYMPLE, Sir CHARLES (Ipswich)  
 DANE, R. M. (Fermanagh, N.)  
 DARLING, C. J. (Deptford)  
 DARWIN, Major (Stafford, Lichfield)  
 DAVIES, HORATIO (Rochester)  
 DE WORMS, Baron HENRY (Liverpool, East Toxteth)  
 DICKSON-POYNDER, Sir JOHN (Wilts, Chippenham)  
 DISRAELI, CONINGSBY (Cheshire, Altrincham)  
 DIXON, GEORGE (Birmingham, Edgbaston)  
 DIXON-HARTLAND, F. D. (Middlesex, Uxbridge)  
 DONKIN, R. S. (Tynemouth)  
 DORINGTON, Sir JOHN (Gloucester, Tewkesbury)  
 DYKE, Sir WILLIAM HART (Kent, Dartford)  
 EGBERTON, A. TATTON (Cheshire, Knutsford)  
 ELCHO, Lord (Ipswich)  
 ELLIOT, G. W. (York, N.R., Richmond)  
 FARQUHARSON, HENRY (Dorset, W.)  
 FEILDEN, Lieut.-General (Lancashire, N. Chorley)  
 FELLOWES, A. E. (Hants, Ramsey)  
 FERGUSSON, Sir JAMES (Manchester, N.E.)  
 FIELD, Admiral (Sussex, Eastbourne)  
 FINCH, G. H. (Rutland)  
 FISHER, W. HAYES (Fulham)  
 FITZGERALD, R. U. PENROSE (Cambridge)  
 FITZWYGRAM, Sir FREDERICK (Hants, S.)  
 FLETCHER, Sir HENRY (Sussex, Lewes)  
 FOLKESTONE, Viscount (Wilts, Wilton)  
 FORSTER, HENRY W. (Kent, Sevenoaks)  
 FORWOOD, A. B. (Lancashire, S.W., Ormskirk)  
 FOSTER, HARRY S. (Suffolk, Lowestoft)  
 FREEMAN-MITFORD, A. B. (Warwick, Stratford)  
 GATHORNE-HARDY, A. E. (Sussex, East Grinstead)  
 GIBBS, ALBAN (London)  
 GIBBS, VICARY (Herts, St. Albans)  
 GILLIAT, J. S. (Lancashire, S.W., Widnes)  
 GODSON, A. F. (Kidderminster)  
 GOLDSMID, Sir JULIAN (St. Pancras, S.)  
 GOLDSWORTHY, Major-General (Hammer-smith)  
 GORDON-LENNOX, Lord WALTER (Sussex, Chichester)  
 GORST, Sir JOHN (Cambridge University)  
 GOSCHEN, G. J. (St. George's, Hanover Square)  
 GRAHAM, H. R. (St. Pancras, W.)  
 GRANBY, Marquess of (Leicestershire, Melton)  
 GREENE, H. D. (Shrewsbury)  
 GRICE-HUTCHINSON, Captain (Aston Manor)  
 GRIFFITH-BOSCAWEN, A. S. T. (Kent, Tunbridge)  
 GUNTER, Colonel (York, W.R., Barkstone Ash)  
 HALSEY, T. F. (Herts, Watford)  
 HAMILTON, Lord FREDERICK (Tyrone, N.)  
 HAMILTON, Lord GEORGE (Middlesex, Ealing)



- HAMOND, C. F. (Newcastle-upon-Tyne)  
 HANBURY, R. W. (Preston)  
 HANSON, Sir REGINALD (London)  
 HARDY, LAURENCE (Kent, Ashford)  
 HARE, T. L. (Norfolk, S.W.)  
 HARLAND, Sir EDWARD (Belfast, N.)  
 HEATH, JAMES (Stafford, N.W.)  
 HEATON, HENNIKER (Canterbury)  
 HERBERT, SIDNEY (Croydon)  
 HERVEY, Lord FRANCIS (Bury St. Edmunds)  
 HICKMAN, Sir ALFRED (Wolverhampton, W.)  
 HILL, Lord ARTHUR (Down, W.)  
 HILL, A. STAVELEY (Stafford, Kingswinford)  
 HILL, Colonel Sir EDWARD (Bristol, S.)  
 HOARE, BRODIE (Hampstead)  
 HOARE, SAMUEL (Norwich)  
 HOBHOUSE, HENRY (Somerset, E.)  
 HORNBY, W. H. (Blackburn)  
 HOULDSWORTH, Sir WILLIAM (Manchester, N.W.)  
 HOUSTON, R. P. (Liverpool, West Toxteth)  
 HOWARD, J. (Middlesex, Tottenham)  
 HOWORTH, Sir HENRY (Salford, S.)  
 HOZIER, J. H. C. (Lanark, S.)  
 HUDSON, G. B. (Herts, Hitchin)  
 HUGHES, Colonel (Woolwich)  
 HULSE, E. H. (Salisbury)  
 ISAACSON, F. W. (Tower Hamlets, Stepney)  
 JACKSON, W. L. (Leeds, N.)  
 JAMES, FRANK (Walsall)  
 JAMES, Sir HENRY (Bury)  
 JEBB, R. C. (Cambridge University)  
 JEFFREYS, A. F. (Hants, Basingstoke)  
 JENNINGS, L. J. (Stockport)  
 JOHNSTON, WILLIAM (Belfast, S.)  
 KENNAWAY, Sir JOHN (Devon, Honiton)  
 KENNY, WILLIAM (Dublin, St. Stephen's Green)  
 KENRICK, WILLIAM (Birmingham, N.)  
 KENYON, G. T. (Denbigh District)  
 KENYON-SLANEY, Colonel (Shropshire, Newport)  
 KIMBER, H. (Wandsworth)  
 KING, H. S. (Hull, Central)  
 KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN, H. T. (Kent, Faversham)  
 KNOWLES, LEES (Salford, W.)  
 LAWRENCE, W. F. (Liverpool, Abergromby)  
 LAWSON, J. GRANT (York, N.R., Thirsk)  
 LEA, THOMAS (Londonderry, S.)  
 LECHMERE, Sir EDMUND (Worcestershire, Evesham)  
 LEIGH, T. W. (Lancashire, S.W., Newton)  
 LEIGHTON, STANLEY (Shropshire, Oswestry)  
 LLOYD, WILSON (Wednesbury)  
 LOCKWOOD, Colonel (Essex, Epping)  
 LODER, GERALD (Brighton)  
 LOPES, H. Y. B. (Grantham)  
 LOWTHER, JAMES (Kent, Thanet)  
 LOWTHER, J. W. (Cumberland, Pe  
 LOYD, Colonel (Chatham)
- LUBBOCK, Sir JOHN (London University)  
 MACARTNEY, W. E. (Antrim, S.)  
 MACDONA, J. C. (Southwark, Rotherhithe)  
 MACLURE, J. W. (Lancashire, S.E., Stretford)  
 MCCALMONT, Captain (Antrim, E.)  
 MALLOCK, R. (Devon, Torquay)  
 MAPLE, JOHN BLUNDELL (Camberwell, Dulwich)  
 MARRIOTT, Sir WILLIAM (Brighton)  
 MARTIN, R. B. (Worcestershire, Droitwich)  
 MATTHEWS, H. (Birmingham, E.)  
 MAXWELL, Sir HERBERT (Wigton)  
 MAXWELL, W. J. (Dumfriesshire)  
 MEYSEY-THOMPSON, Sir HENRY (Stafford Handsworth)  
 MILDMAI, F. B. (Devon, Totnes)  
 MILNER, Sir FREDERICK (Notts, Bassetlaw)  
 MORE, R. J. (Shropshire, Ludlow)  
 MORGAN, Colonel (Monmouth, S.)  
 MOUNT, W. G. (Berks, Newbury)  
 MOWBRAY, Sir JOHN (Oxford University)  
 MOWBRAY, R. G. C. (Lancashire, S.E., Prestwich)  
 MULHOLLAND, H. L. (Londonderry, N.)  
 MUNTZ, P. A. (Warwick, Tamworth)  
 MURRAY, A. GRAHAM (Buteshire)  
 MURRAY, Colonel (Bath)  
 MYERS, W. H. (Winchester)  
 NAYLOR-LEYLAND, Captain (Colchester)  
 NEWARK, Viscount (Notts, Newark)  
 NEWDIGATE, F. A. (Warwick, Nuneaton)  
 NOBLE, WILSON (Hastings)  
 NORTHOOTE, Sir STAFFORD (Exeter)  
 O'NEILL, R. T. (Antrim, Mid)  
 PAGET, Sir RICHARD (Somerset, Wells)  
 PALMER, JAMES (Gravesend)  
 PARKER, FRANCIS (Oxford, Henley)  
 PEARCE, Sir WILLIAM (Plymouth)  
 PEARSON, Sir CHARLES (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities)  
 PENDER, Sir JOHN (Wick Burghs)  
 PENN, JOHN (Lewisham)  
 PIERPOINT, R. (Warrington)  
 PLUNKET, DAVID (Dublin University)  
 PLUNKETT, Horace (Dublin County, S.)  
 POWELL, Sir FRANCIS (Wigan)  
 PRYCE-JONES, Sir PRYCE (Montgomery District)  
 QUILTER, W. C. (Suffolk, Sudbury)  
 RANKIN, J. (Herefordshire, Leominster)  
 RASCH, Major (Essex, S.E.)  
 RENSCHAW, C. B. (Renfrew, W.)  
 RENTOUL, J. A. (Down, E.)  
 RIDLEY, Sir MATTHEW WHITE (Lancashire, N., Blackpool)  
 ROBINSON, BROOKE (Dudley)  
 ROSE, Sir ALBERT (Islington, S.)  
 ROSE, JAMES (Londonderry)  
 ROSE, FERDINAND DE (Bucks, Rich)

RUSSELL, Sir GEORGE (Berks, Wokingham)  
 RUSSELL, T. W. (Tyrone, S.)  
 SANDYS, Colonel (Lancashire, S.W., Bootle)  
 SAUNDERSON, Colonel (Armagh, N.)  
 SAVORY, Sir JOSEPH (Westmoreland, Appleby)  
 SCOBLE, Sir ANDREW (Hackney, Central)  
 SCOTT-MONTAGU, J. (Hants, New Forest)  
 SEAGER-HUNT, FREDERICK (Marylebone, W.)  
 SEELY, Colonel (Nottingham, W.)  
 SETON-KARR, H. (St. Helen's)  
 SHAW-STEWART, M. H. (Renfrew, E.)  
 SHEPHERD-CROSS, H. (Bolton)  
 SIDEBOTHAM, JOSEPH W. (Cheshire, Hyde)  
 SIDEBOTTOM, T. HARROP (Stalybridge)  
 SIDEBOTTOM, Captain WILLIAM (Derbyshire, High Peak)  
 SITWELL, Sir GEORGE (Scarborough)  
 SMITH, ABEL (Herts, E.)  
 SMITH, ABEL H. (Christchurch)  
 SMITH, PARKER (Lanark, Partick)  
 SMITH, FREDERICK (Strand, Westminster)  
 SMITH-BARRY, A. H. (Hunts, S.)  
 SPENCER, ERNEST (West Bromwich)  
 STANHOPE, EDWARD (Lincolnshire, Horncastle)  
 STANLEY, E. G. VILLIERS (Lancashire, S.E., West Houghton)  
 STANLEY, EDW. JAS. (Somerset, Bridgwater)  
 STEPHENS, H. C. (Middlesex, Hornsey)  
 STEWART, MARK (Kirkcudbrightshire)  
 STOCK, J. H. (Liverpool, Walton)  
 STUART-WORTLEY, C. B. (Sheffield, Hallam)  
 STURT, H. N. (Dorset, E.)  
 SUTHERLAND, Sir THOMAS (Greenock)  
 TALBOT, J. G. (Oxford University)  
 TAYLOR, F. (Norfolk, S.)  
 TEMPLE, Sir RICHARD (Surrey, Kingston)

THEOBALD, J. (Essex, Romford)  
 THORBURN, W. (Peebles and Selkirk)  
 THORNTON, P. M. (Clapham)  
 TOLLEMACHE, H. J. (Cheshire, Eddisbury)  
 TOMLINSON, W. E. M. (Preston)  
 TRITTON, C. E. (Lambeth, Norwood)  
 USBORNE, T. (Essex, Chelmsford)  
 VILLIERS, C. P. (Wolverhampton, S.)  
 VINCENT, Colonel HOWARD (Sheffield, Central)  
 WARDE, Major (Kent, Medway)  
 WARING, Colonel (Down, N.)  
 WATKIN, Sir EDWARD (Hythe)  
 WEBSTER, R. G. (St. Pancras, E.)  
 WEBSTER, Sir RICHARD (Isle of Wight)  
 WHITELAW, GRAEME (Lanark, N.W.)  
 WHITELAW, WILLIAM (Perth)  
 WHITMORE, C. A. (Chelsea)  
 WICKHAM, W. (Hants, Petersfield)  
 WILLIAMS, J. CHARLES (Cornwall, Truro)  
 WILLIAMS, J. POWELL (Birmingham, S.)  
 WILLOX, J. A. (Liverpool, Everton)  
 WILSON-TODD, Colonel (York, N.R., Howden-shire)  
 WINGFIELD-DIGBY, J. K. (Dorset, N.)  
 WINN, ROWLAND (Pontefract)  
 WODEHOUSE, E. R. (Bath)  
 WOLFF, G. W. (Belfast, E.)  
 WOLMER, Viscount (Edinburgh, W.)  
 WRIGHT, H. SMITH (Nottingham, S.)  
 WRIGHTSON, T. (Stockton-on-Tees)  
 WROUGHTON, P. (Berks, Abingdon)  
 WYNDHAM, G. (Dover)  
 YERBURGH, R. A. (Chester)

## TELLERS.

Mr. A. AKERS-DOUGLAS.  
 Sir WILLIAM WALROND.

AYES, 350—NOES, 310. - - - - - 660

## MEMBERS WHO DID NOT RECORD THEIR VOTES.

Mr. SPEAKER PEEL (Warwick and Leamington.) - - - - - 1

## TELLERS FOR THE AYES.

Mr. ARNOLD MORLEY (Nottingham, E.) }  
 Mr. E. MAJORIBANKS (Berwickshire.) } - - - - - 2

## TELLERS FOR THE NOES.

Mr. A. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's.) }  
 Sir WILLIAM WALROND (Devon, Tiverton.) } - - - - - 2

## ABSENT.

Mr. A. B. WINTERBOTHAM (Gloucester, Cirencester) [ill-health]  
 Mr. J. L. WHARTON (York, West Riding, Ripon) - [ill-health]  
 Mr. T. CURRAN (Sligo, S.) - [in Australia.] } Paired. } 3

## SEATS VACANT.

Finsbury, Holborn—Member Elevated to the Bench (see page 79). }  
 Cork, N.E.—Double Return (see page 80). } - - - - - 2

670

The House of Commons consists of 670 Members.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Monday, 15th August, 1892.*

H.R.H. The Duke of Edinburgh—  
Singly took the Oath.

Several Lords—took the Oath.

QUEEN'S SPEECH—HER MAJESTY'S  
ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

THE LORD CHAMBERLAIN OF  
THE HOUSEHOLD (The Earl of  
LATHOM) reported Her Majesty's  
Answer to the Address as follows:—

"I have received with great satisfaction the  
loyal and dutiful expression of your thanks for  
the Speech with which I have opened the  
present Session of Parliament."

## RESIGNATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND  
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR  
FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess  
of SALISBURY): My Lords, it is my  
duty to announce to your Lordships,  
what has already reached you through  
other channels of information, that,  
in consequence of the vote which took  
place in the House of Commons on  
Thursday night, Her Majesty's Govern-  
ment have placed their resignation in  
the hands of Her Majesty, who has  
been graciously pleased to accept it, and  
we only hold our Seats now until our  
successors are appointed. It is not, I  
believe, usual for the outgoing Ministers  
to make any observations on an occa-  
sion of this kind; but I have known  
cases in which the incoming Minister  
takes the opportunity of giving an  
account of his views on various public  
questions. I am sure that, if the noble  
Earl opposite should think fit to follow  
that precedent and give us an exposi-  
tion of the intentions of the incoming  
Ministry on domestic and foreign  
affairs, we should listen to him with  
a great deal of pleasure.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I am  
sorry I cannot respond to the invitation  
of the noble Marquess. For one reason,  
I am not at present a Minister of the  
Crown, and I should not feel able, not  
having an opportunity of consulting  
colleagues who do not exist, of making  
any statement on the subject.

## SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY:  
Perhaps it would be convenient if the  
noble Lord would fix the time to  
which he desires the House should  
adjourn.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: If the  
noble Marquess will be kind enough to  
move it, I think it would be most con-  
venient that the House should adjourn  
till Thursday next—the same day as the  
House of Commons is adjourned to.

House adjourned at half-past Four o'clock,  
to Thursday next, a quarter past  
Four o'clock.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Thursday, 18th August, 1892.*

The House met at a quarter past  
Four of the clock.

Several Lords—took the Oath.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

## PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

The LORDS COMMISSIONERS—namely,  
The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Herschell);  
The SECRETARY OF STATE for INDIA  
(The Earl of Kimberley); The FIRST  
LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Earl Spencer);  
The SECRETARY of STATE for the  
COLONIES (The Marquess of Ripon);  
and the Viscount OXENBRIDGE—being  
in their Robes, and seated on a Form  
placed between the Throne and the  
Woolsack, commanded the Yeoman  
Usher of the Black Rod (Captain  
Butler) to let the COMMONS know "The

Lords Commissioners desire their immediate Attendance in this House, to hear the Commission read."

Who being at the Bar, with their Speaker;—A Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read by the Clerk;

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said:—

*My Lords and Gentlemen,*

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Friday the fourth day of November next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued till Friday the fourth day of November next.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Thursday, 18th August, 1892.*

The House met at Three of the clock.

### NEW WRITS.

On the Motion of the Right Hon. E. MARJORIBANKS, the following New Writs were issued:—

*For* County of Edinburgh, *v.* Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone, First Commissioner of the Treasury.

County of Fife (Eastern Division), *v.* Herbert H. Asquith, esquire, Secretary of State.

Stirling District of Burghs, *v.* Right Hon. Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Secretary of State.

Borough of Derby, *v.* Right Hon. Sir William George Granville Vernon Harcourt, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Borough of Glasgow (Bridgeton Division), *v.* Right Hon. Sir George Otto Trevelyan, baronet, Secretary for Scotland.

VOL. VII. [FOURTH SERIES.]

Borough of Sheffield (Brightside Division), *v.* Right Hon. Anthony John Mundella, President of the Board of Trade.

Borough of Wolverhampton (Eastern Division), *v.* Right Hon. Henry Hartley Fowler, President of the Local Government Board.

Borough of Nottingham (Eastern Division), *v.* Arnold Morley, esquire, Postmaster General.

Yorkshire (Rotherham Division), *v.* Arthur Herbert Dyke Acland, esquire, Vice President of the Council for Education.

Borough of Aberdeen (Southern Division), *v.* James Bryce, esquire, Chancellor of Duchy of Lancaster.

Borough of Bradford, *v.* Right Hon. George Shaw Lefevre, First Commissioner of Works.

On the Motion of the Right Hon. A. AKERS-DOUGLAS:—

*For* Borough of Bury Saint Edmunds, *v.* Lord Francis Hervey, Civil Service Commissioner.

MR. SPEAKER: The remaining Writs, I understand, will be moved later. I propose to suspend the Sitting until half-past four, for the sole purpose of issuing the remainder of the Writs.

(3.25.) Sitting suspended.

(4.38.) Mr. SPEAKER returned to the Chair.

### AUTUMN SESSION.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (West Ham, S.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to put a question of which I have given you private notice. Perhaps you will allow me to offer one word of explanation as to why I put the question. On Thursday last week I gave notice of an Amendment to the Address; but when the Amendment then before the House was disposed of there was so much noise and confusion that I did not even hear the Main Question put; and I anticipated that to-day there would be an opportunity of discussing the point embodied in my Amendment. I find, however, that under the ordinary Rules

of the House there will be no such opportunity. The question which I desire to put now, Sir, is whether, in view of the interest that has been awakened on the question of holding an Autumn Session for the consideration of measures designed to improve the condition of the people, there is any way by which the sense of the House can now be taken for the guidance of the Ministry now in process of formation?

MR. SPEAKER: In reference to the first part of the hon. Gentleman's question, I have to say that I was aware that the hon. Member handed in his Amendment, and it was owing, no doubt, to a want of knowledge of the Forms of the House on the part of the hon. Member that he did not rise to move his Amendment. I put the Main Question, as hon. Gentlemen are aware, and though there was, no doubt, considerable noise in the House, and the hon. Gentleman possibly did not hear the Question put, I was not responsible for that. The Question was put, and no other Amendment was put. With reference to the question which the hon. Gentleman now asks me—whether an opportunity can be given for discussing the question—I have to say that it is not in accordance with Constitutional usage or precedent when the House meets under circumstances such as the present that there should be any discussion at all; least of all any vote come to on any question. There is a deficiency in our Parliamentary system at this moment. A Ministry has gone out and the new Ministry has not yet come in. The Members of that Ministry are not yet qualified to take their seats or to answer any questions. It is, I repeat, in accordance with Parliamentary usage and Constitutional custom that nothing can be done on the present occasion, but with one purpose, and that purpose, for which the House meets to-day, is to supply that deficiency by moving the Writs to enable the incoming Ministry to become duly qualified Members of the House. Under these circumstances I am sorry to have to inform the hon. Member that there is nothing else before the House at present.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: In the event of the House being unanimous now, I wish to ask you further, Sir, is it possible to have the question raised?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no responsible Ministry of the Crown to give a definite answer to the question, and it is quite beyond the ordinary usage and custom of Parliament for the House to discuss questions in the absence of the responsible advisers of the Crown.

#### NEW WRITS.

On the Motion of the Right Hon. E. MARJORIBANKS, the following New Writs were issued:—

*For* Borough of Newcastle upon Tyne, *v.* Right Hon. John Morley, Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

County of Cornwall (Mid or St. Austell Division), *v.* William Alexander McArthur, esquire, Commissioner of the Treasury.

Borough of Southwark (Western Division), *v.* Richard Knight Causton, esquire, Commissioner of the Treasury.

County of Merionethshire, *v.* Thomas Edward Ellis, esquire, Commissioner of the Treasury.

Hackney (South Division), *v.* Sir Charles Russell, Q.C., Attorney General.

County of Forfar, *v.* John Rigby, esquire, Solicitor General.

Counties of Clackmannan and Kinross, *v.* Right Hon. John Blair Balfour, Lord Advocate for Scotland.

Elgin District of Burghs, *v.* Alexander Asher, esquire, Solicitor General for Scotland.

County of Northampton (Mid Division), *v.* Hon. Charles Robert Spencer, Vice Chamberlain of Her Majesty's Household.

Stoke upon Trent, *v.* George Granville Leveson-Gower, esquire, Comptroller of Her Majesty's Household.

(4.48.) MR. E. MARJORIBANKS  
(Berwickshire): I move that the Sitting  
be suspended till Nine o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed its Sitting at  
Nine o'clock.

**PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT.**

Message to attend the Lords Com-  
missioners;—

The House went;—

A Commission for proroguing Parlia-  
ment was read.

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said:—

*My Lords and Gentlemen,*

By virtue of Her Majesty's Com-  
mission, under the Great Seal, to us  
and other Lords directed, and now  
read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name,  
and in obedience to Her Commands,  
prorogue this Parliament to Friday the  
fourth day of November next, to be  
then here holden; and this Parliament  
is accordingly prorogued till Friday the  
fourth day of November next.

# INDEX

TO

## THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

AUTHORISED EDITION.

---

### VOLUME VII. FOURTH SERIES,

BEING THE

### FIRST & ONLY VOLUME OF SECOND SESSION 1892.

---

#### EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills, Read 1<sup>a</sup>, 1<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>o</sup>, 3<sup>a</sup>, 3<sup>o</sup>, Read the  
First, Second, or Third Time.  
1R., 2R., 3R. Speech delivered on  
First, Second, or Third Reading.  
Adj. Adjourned.  
A. Answers.  
Cols. Colonies.  
c. Commons.  
Com. Committee.  
com. Committed.

Dept. Department.  
Intro. Introduced.  
l. Lords.  
Obs. Observations.  
Pres. Presented.  
Q. Questions.  
Re-com. Re-committed.  
Rep. Reported.  
R.P. Report Progress.  
Reso. Resolution.

The subjects of Debate, as far as possible, are classified under General Headings:—*e.g.*,  
ARMY—BOARD OF AGRICULTURE—BOARD OF TRADE—COLONIES—EDUCATION—FOREIGN  
AFFAIRS—INDIA—IRELAND—NAVY—PARLIAMENT—POST OFFICE—SCOTLAND, &c.

**A**CT of Union, 182

Adjournment moved

Mr. A. J. Balfour, 194; Mr. T. M. Healy,  
304; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 432

Adjournment of Debate moved

Mr. Leveson-Gower, 184; Mr. Joseph  
Chamberlain, 300

ADMIRALTY

First Lord—*Lord George Hamilton*

VOL. VII. [FOURTH SERIES.]

Afghanistan, British Mission to

Q. Mr. J. Seymour Keay, A. Mr. G. N.  
Curzon, 305

“Agent of Satan,” 355, 356

Agrarian Offences, 203, 219

Agricultural Holdings, 23, 36, 207

AKERS-DOUGLAS, Right Hon. A. (see  
DOUGLAS)

X

- ALLEN, Mr. W. S., *Newcastle-under-Lyme*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 368, 398
- Allies and Masters, 223, 341, 362
- Allotment Land, Chard, 312
- Allowance, Customs Officers, 312
- American Safeguards, 400
- Amnesty, 177, 210, 281
- Anthrax Outbreak in Sussex  
Q. Admiral Field, A. Mr. H. Chaplin, 318
- Arrears, Land Act, 207, 220
- Ascendancy, 33
- ASQUITH, Mr. H. H., *Fife, E.*  
Queen's Speech — Moving Amendt. to  
Address, 93-105; 116, 417
- ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir CHARLES  
RUSSELL)  
New Writ on Appointment, 452
- Autumn Session, 176, 208, 280, 377  
Q. Mr. Keir Hardie, A. Mr. Speaker, 450-452
- Bad Traditions, 200
- BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH, LORD  
(Secretary to Board of Trade)  
A Lord Commissioner, 17
- BALFOUR, RIGHT HON. A. J. (First  
Lord of the Treasury), *Manchester, E.*  
Adjournment of House, 432  
Business of the House (Bills), 82  
Election of a Speaker, 14  
Exemption from Standing Orders, 332  
New Metropolitan Fever Hospital, 193, 325  
Pensions and Superannuations Return, 327  
Queen's Speech—Address, 216  
Railways in West Highlands, 326  
Suspension of Twelve o'clock Rule, 194, 332
- BARRY, Mr. E., *Cork Co., S.*  
Benduff Slate Quarry Accident, 321
- BARTON, Mr. D. P., *Armagh, Mid*  
Queen's Speech—Moving Address in Answer  
to, 82-89
- BEACH, RIGHT HON. SIR M. E. HIC  
(President of the Board of Trade)  
*Bristol, W.*  
"Godolphin," Crew of, and British Com  
at New York, 314  
Mixed Trains on Irish Railways, 324
- Beaconsfield, Lord, 196  
(See Disraeli, Mr.)
- Beer, 242, 244; Beerhouses, 385
- Benduff Slate Quarry Accident  
Q. Mr. E. Barry, Mr. J. Gilhooly, A. H  
Jackson, 321
- BENN, Mr. J. W., *Tower Hamlets, S*  
*George's*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 382-386
- Blunderbuss, Story of a, 122
- BOARD OF AGRICULTURE  
President—Mr. H. Chaplin
- BOARD OF TRADE  
President—Sir M. E. Hicks Beach
- BODKIN, Mr. M., *Roscommon, N.*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 285
- Borrowing, unrestricted, 257
- "Boss us," 351; "Bossed," 358
- BOWLES, Mr. T. Gibson, *King's Lynn*  
Mission to Morocco, 330
- Boycotting, 33, 52, 121, 226
- British Columbian Loan  
Q. Mr. H. Seton-Karr, A. Sir John Gor  
328  
Emigration of Crofters, 330
- British East Africa Company, 191
- British Wants, 213
- Brown, Thomas, Service of  
Q. Mr. Thomas Healy, A. Mr. E. Stanhop  
311
- Browning, Mr. Oscar, 173, 242, 354  
403
- BROWNLOW, EARL (Under Secretar  
of State for War)  
A Lord Commissioner, 21



- Brute Vote, 142, 267
- "Bury Cæsar," 94, 106
- BURT, Mr. T., *Morpeth*  
Queen's Speech—Seconding Amendt. to Address, 105-111
- CAMPERDOWN, Earl of  
Queen's Speech—Address, 51-54, 73
- Canada, Constitution of, 114, 173, 370, 401
- Canossa, going to, 287
- CARSON, Mr. E. (Solicitor General for Ireland), *Dublin University*  
Crown Solicitors and Elections, 316  
District Writ Registries, Belfast and Cork, 319
- Cavan Town Loan and Local Government Board  
Q. Mr. E. F. V. Knox, A. Mr. W. L. Jackson, 309
- CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. Joseph, *Birmingham, W.*  
Adj. of Debate moved, 300  
Queen's Speech—Address, 303, 334-354
- CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER (Mr. JAMES BRYCE)  
New Writ on Appointment, 450
- CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir WILLIAM V. HARCOURT)  
New Writ on Appointment, 449
- CHAPLIN, Right Hon. Henry (President of Board of Agriculture), *Lincolnshire, Sleaford*  
Anthrax in Sussex, 318  
Pleuro-Pneumonia and Inoculation, 322, 323  
Queen's Speech—Address, 422-430  
Seizures of Bad Meat, 323  
Tuberculosis Commission, 192
- Chard, Allotment Land at  
Q. Mr. E. Strachey, A. Mr. C. A. Whitmore, 311
- "Cheap Loaf," 40, 241
- CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. JOHN MORLEY)  
New Writ on Appointment, 452
- Chinese Government and Dr. Greig  
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 316
- Civil Servants and Elections  
Q. Mr. S. Woods, Mr. H. P. Cobb, Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 188-191
- CLANCY, Mr. J. J., *Dublin Co., N.*  
Alleged Assault by National Teacher, 306  
Cormican in Dundrum Asylum, 306
- CLARK, Dr. G. B., *Caithness*  
Disturbances in Pahang, 315
- CLARKE, Sir E. G. (Solicitor General), *Plymouth*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 371-381
- Clery and Cheesman's Dismissal, 188
- COBB, Mr. H. P., *Warwick, S.E., Rugby*  
Clery and Cheesman, Messrs., Dismissal of 188, 190
- "Coerce Great Britain," 215
- "Coercing the Majority," 119
- Coercion and Coercion Acts, 66, 123, 124, 137, 203, 205, 218, 235, 293, 370, 395, 429  
"Out of the Question," 42
- "Collection of Parties," 54
- COLLINGS, Mr. Jesse, *Birmingham, Bordesley*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 149-163
- COLONIES  
Under Secretary of State—Baron H. de Worms
- COMMISSIONERS OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. A. MCARTHUR, Mr. R. K. CAUSTON, Mr. T. E. ELLIS)  
New Writs on Appointment, 452
- COMPTON, Earl, *York, W.R., Barnsley*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 302, 335
- COMPTROLLER OF HER MAJESTY'S HOUSEHOLD (Mr. G. G. LEVESON-GOWER)  
New Writ on Appointment, 452
- Compulsory Purchase, 241
- Concurrent Legislation, 230, 367

- FIELD, Mr. William, *Dublin, St. Patrick's*  
Mixed Trains, Irish Railways, 323  
Pleuro-Pneumonia and Inoculation, 322, 323  
Queen's Speech—Address, 381  
Seizures of Bad Meat, 323  
Tuberculosis Commission, 192
- "Fighting Politician," 122
- Financial Portion, 1886 Scheme, 174, 256
- FIRST COMMISSIONER OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. E. GLADSTONE)  
New Writ on Appointment, 449
- FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. G. SHAW LEFEVRE)  
New Writ on Appointment, 450
- FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON)  
Succeeded by Earl SPENCER, 448
- Fishing Institutions, Ireland, 331
- "Five blessed Parliaments," 404
- Five great Conditions, 133
- Five Questions, 337
- Fool's Paradise, 271, 343
- 'Foredoomed,' 354, 430
- FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
Secretary of State—*Marquess of Salisbury*
- Foreign Policy, 41, 64, 75, 263, 272, 339, 340, 375, 397
- Fort William and Mallaig Railway, 326
- "Free and unfettered Control," 171, 172, 174, 351, 365
- Free Education, 91, 153
- Free hand," 101, 410, 411
- Galway and Clifden Railway  
Q. Colonel Nolan, A. Mr. W. L. Jackson, 191
- Gas, Water, and Electricity," 93, 158, 159, 345
- "Giant's Strength," 215
- GIBBS, Mr. Vicary, *Herts, St. Albans*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 390
- GILHOOLY, Mr. J., *Cork Co., W.*  
Benduff Slate Quarry Accident, 321  
Durrus Petty Sessions Clerk, 321, 322
- GLADSTONE, Right Hon. W. E., *Edinburgh, Midlothian*  
Election of a Speaker, 8  
Queen's Speech—Address in Answer to, 195-216, 218, 219, 339, 407
- Gladstonian Party, 47, 48, 153, 271  
G. or G.L., 128  
Gladstonian Peers, 50
- "Godolphin" Crew and British Consul  
Q. Mr. J. Havelock Wilson, A. Sir M. H. Beach, 313
- "Golden shower of British beneficence," 104, 403
- GORST, Right Hon. Sir John E (Secretary to the Treasury), *Cambridge University*  
British Columbia, Loan for, 328  
Customs Officers Allowances, 312  
Irish Probate Division Clerks, 319  
Scotch Crofters Emigration, 330
- GOSCHEN, Right Hon. G. J. (Chancellor of the Exchequer), *St. George's, Hanover Square*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 111-122
- GOWER, Mr. G. G. Leveson- (see LEVESON-GOWER)
- Greenock Election, Corrected Return, 187
- Greig, Dr., Claim against Chinese Government, 316
- Half-timers, 108
- HALSBURY, Lord (The Lord Chancellor)  
A Lord Commissioner, 2, 16, 21  
Approving of the Speaker, 17, 18, 19  
Minutes of Meeting for Election of Representative Peers for Scotland, 22  
Opening of Parliament, 3  
Queen's Speech delivered, 21
- HAMILTON, Lord Frederick, *Tyrone, N*  
Strabane Post Office, 329

- HAMILTON, RIGHT HON. LORD  
GEORGE (First Lord of the  
Admiralty), *Middlesex, Ealing*  
Sunday Observance by Naval Officers, 319
- HARCOURT, Right Hon. Sir William G.  
Vernon, *Derby*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 116
- HARDIE, Mr. Keir, *West Ham, S.*  
Autumn Session, 450, 452
- HARRINGTON, Mr. Timothy C., *Dublin,*  
*Harbour Division*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 278-282  
The Prisoner Egan, 193
- HEALY, Mr. Maurice, *Cork*  
Dublin and Cork Mails, 320
- HEALY, Mr. Timothy M., *Louth, N.*  
Bonus for Irish Constabulary, 308  
Brown, Private Thomas, Case of, 311  
Ensign for Fishery Department, 307  
Moved Adj. of House, 304  
Olphert, Mr., Appointment of, 327, 328  
Post Office Dismissals, 190  
Private Bills—Standing Orders, 187  
Queen's Speech—Address, 227, 300, 301, 351  
Richmond Prison, Dublin, 194
- "Hell upon Earth," 226
- Herculean Labour, 353
- H.M.S. "Garnet" at Callao, 319
- HERSCHELL, Lord  
Queen's Speech—Address, 71-78  
(*Lord Chancellor*)  
A Lord Commissioner, 448  
Prorogation of Parliament, 449
- HOBHOUSE, Mr. H., *Somerset, E.*  
Trained Nurses and Technical Instruction  
Act, 317
- HOME OFFICE  
Secretary of State—*Mr. H. Matthews*
- Home Rule, 26, 27, 32, 46, 49, 51, 53,  
73, 87, 93, 99, 106, 114, 116, 120,  
123, 125, 128, 133, 155, 160, 162,  
169, 174, 180, 212, 245, 253, 290,  
291, 345, 364, 367, 370, 376, 406,  
416
- Homogeneous Party, 181, 184, 220,  
341, 343
- Hottentots, 164, 364
- Hours of Labour, 92, 110, 154
- House of Lords, 98, 212, 213, 283, 400,  
416, 417, 418, 423, 428
- HOWARD, Mr. J., *Middlesex, Tottenham*  
New Fever Hospital, 324
- HULSE, Mr. E. H., *Salisbury*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 262-266
- Illegal Distraint  
Q. Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, A. Mr.  
Matthews, 317
- Illiterates, 252
- "Ill-starred Abortion," 150, 163, 336
- Imposture and Pretence, 103, 151, 154
- "Independent," The, 87, 250, 269, 285
- INDIA  
Secretary of State—*Viscount Cross*
- Indian Currency  
Q. Mr. S. Smith, A. Mr. G. N. Curzon, 328
- Indian Questions, 261
- Inoculation for Pleuro-Pneumonia, 322
- Intimidation, 219, 226
- Intolerance, 27
- IRELAND  
Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant—  
*Mr. W. L. Jackson*
- Ireland  
"Blocks the way," 166, 179, 270, 426  
Condition of, 34, 65, 66, 88  
"My sole link with public life," 212  
"The determining question," 209
- Irish Appointments, 327
- Irish Brigade, or Contingent, 98, 119,  
238
- Irish Constabulary, Bonus for  
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Mr. W. L. Jackson,  
308
- Irish Fishery Department Ensign  
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Mr. W. L. Jackson,  
307

National Debt Reduction, 207

National League, 42, 67

Nationalist Party, 28, 40, 47, 102, 165, 224, 226, 229, 282, 350, 352, 419

National Teacher, Alleged Assault by  
Q. Mr. J. J. Clancy, A. Mr. W. L. Jackson, 306

Naval Officers and Sunday Observance, 319

Navy, Strengthening the, 25, 31, 91, 397

NAYLOR-LELAND, Captain H. S., *Colchester*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 136-141

Nebular Hypothesis, 225, 336, 339, 343, 344

"Nebulous Hypothesis," 202, 352

Newcastle Programme, 68, 130, 138, 157, 167, 207, 233, 367, 426

"New Life, stirrings of," 104

NOLAN, Colonel J. P., *Galway, N.*  
Congested Districts Board Reports, 331  
Disturbances in Uganda, 191  
Galway and Clifden Railway, 191  
Kilbannon, Post Office for, 305

NORTHBROOK, Earl of  
Queen's Speech—Address, 43-51

Nulty, Dr. (Bishop), 251, 287

Nurse Training and County Councils, 317

O'CONNOR, Mr. Arthur, *Donegal, E.*  
New Fever Hospital, 194

O'CONNOR, Mr. T. P., *Liverpool, Scotland*  
Queen's Speech—Address, 233-245

Old Man of the Sea, 167, 278, 344, 365

Olphert, Mr., Appointment of, 300  
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Mr. Jackson, 327

Omens, 89, 137

One Man one Vote (see Plural Votes)

Opinions Represented, 57

Orange Ascendancy, 292

Outlawries Bill

c. Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 81

Owenmore Fisheries

Q. Sir Thomas Esmonde, A. Mr. W. L. Jackson, 314

OXENBRIDGE, Viscount

A Lord Commissioner for Prorogation, 448

Pagans and Paganism, 287, 355

Pahang Disturbances

Q. Dr. G. B. Clark, A. Baron H. de Worms, 315

Palmerston, Lord, and Chinese Rebellion, 123

Parish Councils, 27, 155, 159, 207, 236,

## Parliament

### LORDS—

MEETING OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM, 4th Aug.

The FIRST SESSION of PARLIAMENT opened by Commission

ROLL OF THE LORDS—Delivered

Certificate of the Election of Sixteen Representative Peers for Scotland—Delivered

Presentation and Approval of Speaker of the House of Commons, 5th Aug. 17

### Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech

delivered by The LORD CHANCELLOR

The Queen's Speech having been reported by the LORD CHANCELLOR, an Address to HER MAJESTY thereon moved by the Earl of DENBIGH, 8th Aug. 22 (the Motion being seconded by the Earl of POWIS, 29). Address agreed to, *nem. dis.* 78

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS  
Reported, Earl of LATHOM, 15th Aug. 433

### Committees

Chairman of Committees — The Earl of Morley appointed, *nem. dis.*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session 8th Aug. 79

Appeal Committee, Appointed, 79

Journals, Sub-Committee for, Appointed, 79

Privileges, Committee for, Appointed, 79

[cont.]

